

House Finance,  
I support HJR 23 under these conditions:

1. 50/50 split
2. "Shall" language

No ad hoc. Require a % draw to go directly to the existing CBR for a glide path for deficit spending.

A POMV will give consistency to the revenue for government which is essential going forward.

Thank you  
Michael Chambers

---

The PFD will benefit Alaska's citizens and economy far more in people's hands than in the government's. Continue to look for actual ways to cut spending instead of looking for more ways to take from the people. Mukkove Johnson

---

Please vote NO. And keep the PFD at 50:50 as Hammond created it. Doing any else is hurting Alaska's people and economy.

Please vote to enshrine the PFD for our future kids. We gave up our mineral rights and now you're taking the PFD we agreed for from us and our future kids. My family desperately needs this money for bills and off setting food costs since my husband was laid off a couple years ago. We've been barely making ends meet with us both working. I've seen many friends and family leave this state in the last two years solely because they can't not afford the high cost of living anymore.

> When I went to Minnesota two years ago fit family issues, I did look into land and homes. Their property taxes are a fraction of ours. Example, the home I was looking at was 125 acres, a house and barn with a property taxes bill of \$1860 annually. I pay \$4100 for 0.92 acres in Wasilla.  
>  
> We use our PFD for our kids also. At this point, we are seriously thinking of sending them to a different college instead of UAA due to fees.  
>  
> ~Sarah Dayton

---

My name is Jon Curtis from Soldotna, representing myself and having arrived in Alaska in 1996. I'm testifying today regarding HJR 23 or CS HJR 23, as the text keeps changing. While there are a few good points to this proposed constitutional amendment, there are more bad points, so I will urge a NO vote on this proposed constitutional amendment as it is presently written.

Here are the good points:

First, there is no change to the Permanent Fund itself.

Second, you are requiring a vote of the people on this matter.

Here are the bad points:

First, the 33% of the draw is really a dividend cut, if any is paid at all, under the "may appropriate" language. I want a 50% draw for a dividend, in accordance with the Hammond 50/50 split for government and the people's dividend, and that it be guaranteed in the constitution. According to the state's ISER (Institute of Social and Economic Research), cutting the PFD (from 50/50) has the "largest adverse impact" on the overall economy and is "by far the costliest to Alaska families" of all

of the so-called new revenue options. Cuts at the proposed level also will push upwards of an additional 12-15,000 Alaskans into poverty."

Second, the proposed 4.75% POMV with a minimum floor of \$1,250 per resident or any maximum ceiling is not good, as it constrains the people's portion of the dividend with no corresponding constraint on government spending. I could agree to a 5% POMV draw with a range to accommodate changes in market conditions, but I also don't feel that a POMV approach is necessary, unless the people get the guarantee of a 50/50 split of Permanent Fund earnings.

Third, what is being enshrined is increasing to a  $\frac{3}{4}$  vote access to the remaining Earnings Reserve. Increases like this in excess of a majority vote has been problematic in the past with the CBR and has led to larger budgets than necessary when certain legislators withhold their vote for pork.

Fourth, concerning inflation-proofing, a provision to put any amount the legislators want back into the Permanent Fund from the Earnings Reserve appears to be an "umbrella" over the existing inflation proofing statute still on the books. The latter is archaic and obsolete, given the size of the Permanent Fund and its realized earnings now, so we don't need to inflation-proof like we did when the Fund was first conceived or in its' infancy.

Also, I want "shall" language for any PFD distribution so that the PFD will be immune from any Governor's veto or legislative under-appropriation.

Finally, I want language to have the Legislature confirm all Alaska Permanent Fund Corporation Board members. There is no reason to give any Governor such unlimited power to appoint Board members to such an important agency without legislative oversight.

In conclusion, HJR 23 or CS HJR 23 should NOT be passed as written. Instead, please adopt SJR 1 or HJR 34, a true proposed constitutional amendment to guarantee the people's PFD and the current calculation formula. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,  
Jon Curtis

---

Testimony Regarding HJR 23 (Constitutional Amendment regarding the PFD)

To: House Finance Committee, Alaska State Legislature

From: Lynn Willis, Eagle River, Alaska

Date: 9 March 2018

**"The legislature shall provide for a dividend payment to State residents of not less than \$1250 for each resident each year. If the transfer under (b) of this section is insufficient for a dividend payment of \$1250 for each resident, the legislature shall appropriate the necessary amount from the general fund."**

I oppose HJR23.

I understand each \$1,000 of PFD payment requires approximately \$670 million of state revenues (see note 1). I also understand that in a recent stock market decline the Permanent Fund lost approximately 4% of its value or about 3 billion dollars (Note 2). Given those facts, am I to believe that the PFD is to be paid above any other obligation regardless of the circumstances?

How do you expect to face the next '64 quake, meet the obligations currently facing this state, or approach the Federal Government for necessary federal funds if you attempt to explain that you simply cannot do so because you have this mandate to hand out cash to residents regardless of need?

This is political pandering at its worst. If you don't want to be stewards of state revenues and simply hide behind this kind of self-imposed mandate - please catch the next plane or other conveyance home. This proposal is not a good idea and I urge you to vote against it. Thank you.

Note 1: (ADN 2 Dec 2017) "The Legislature's decision this year to forgo the historical formula means the state will spend about \$670 million on dividends, instead of the roughly \$1.5 billion that would have been budgeted before."

Note 2: (ADN 14 Feb 2018) 'The [Alaska Permanent Fund](#) has lost nearly \$3 billion, or about 4 percent of its value, in a two-and-a-half-week span amid the recent stock market slide, according to figures provided by the fund.'

Lynn Willis

---

March 12, 2018

After reading the latest changes to HJR23, I am not happy about wording in this bill. I appreciate your efforts to put the the PFD in the state constitution. I also appreciate that it will be put to a vote by the people that elected you.

What I am not happy with is the 33% draw for PFD payments. That is a cut to our PFD that is already in statute. A statute which most of you ignored. The draw should be 50% for PFD payments and 50% for government as what Hammonds intent for the fund.

The PFD that has already been cut and is on tap to get cut again in October has had detrimental effects on my budget and too many others. I had to make several difficult choices of things I absolutely need and could have gotten without a cut. For the first time in my life, I am having to go to a food bank to supplement not being able to buy all my groceries.

I am asking you to vote no on this proposal as it does not adequately protect the People's dividend in the constitution and there is no spending cap either included in this bill.

We need more cuts on your end. The citizens have had to endure \$1000s taken from our budgets and this is not what should be done during times of recession. The PFD cut had the worst effect on Alaska families and people like me (I am on disability due to mental illness). We need the full PFD to pump money into the economy.

Thank you for your time. Please vote "no" on this proposal.

Sincerely,

Kevin Fortney

---

Please don't even think about cutting the PFD ( in the Constitution, no less!) while continuing to fund Gov. Walker's absurd pipe dream — or should I call it a "pipeline" dream? Or while funding everything (or nearly everything, but I think it's literally everything) that Reps. Tilton and Wilson recommended cutting.

This is especially bad for rural friends who depend on it for a big chunk of their cash economy. It is the most regressive "tax" of any I've heard described.

You are not fooling anyone by calling it a "protection" of the PFD.

Sincerely,  
Elyce Santerre  
Chugiak Alaska

---

The Alaska PFD, including the PFD corporation and all associated instruments and assets, is a public-servant managed trust of the Alaskan people, not a trust of the government or any other entity or person(s). The people who have made moves to restate any part of this trust do not represent the Alaskan people, and in fact, many of our elected/hired/appointed public employees have gone off-track in the pursuit of derailing our public trusts, without legal authority, of which the Alaska PFD is one of many. Our public servants behave as if the employer (the public) is the last one who should have any say in how things are run (by the employee). Our public servants know what the Alaskan people, have said, en masse, and are acting in insubordination. There will be a reckoning, corrective action, and our public servants will be held accountable. At what cost, though, remains to be seen. We might have to suffer more, for a season, of their want and their wanton waste.

Please choose legacy over lucre. People first, politicians last. There must be someone who wants to garner, or win back, the respect of the public they once desired to serve.

Respectfully,  
Darlene Holmberg  
Aniak

---

Thank You Carol !

I am fully committed to inform and educate the people of Alaska about the theft of their pdf dividend and who the thieves are. Your information is very useful, accurate and easy to communicate to all. I support making the original formula permanent. John Miller

On Mon, Mar 12, 2018 at 3:24 PM, Carol Carman <[district9@mtaonline.net](mailto:district9@mtaonline.net)> wrote:  
**Dear Rebellious Reps,**

**I am opposed to HJR 23.**

Until we have a governor who will make meaningful cuts to the operating budget, legislators have no business stealing the people's money. The PFD is the people's money. If you have doubts about that, here is a six part series of videos about it with interviews from the founders of the Permanent Fund, and a short video statement by Governor Hammond:

<https://www.360north.org/video/trust-us-rainy-day-dream-away-part-1/>  
<https://www.facebook.com/PFDAK/videos/1833427983649886/>

Additionally, attached you will see a certificate issued to all Alaska Residents, signed by Governor Hickel in 1992, confirming citizen ownership of the PFD. Consequently, taking **OUR PFD** is theft.

**I sincerely hope you will give up your rebellious ideas to steal from the people, and do something that will encourage the people of Alaska to respect you.**

Bcc: District 9 Committee, and other people who care about our state - who are welcome to 'reply all' and send you their own messages.

*Carol Carman  
Chair, ARP District 9E*

---

You folks have devastated Alaskans so so SO BAD already!!! Leave OUR PFD alone!! You took food out of families mouths, you took money from us who were paying bills, catching up on bills, buying items for our families, Christmas gifts, shopping in Alaska which put money BACK IN TO THE ECONOMY! Where the samhill is your people's common sense???!!!!!! People are moving out of Alaska cause they can no longer afford to live here. INSTEAD of making it better for them and businesses [many have closed since you folks have taken the PFD away from us in big chunks!] So many cannot afford to shop anymore....my family lives paycheck to paycheck and eek by. We use our PFD for doctors, dentists, & to stock up our pantry and pay a few bills. Thanks alot for taking that buffer away!!!

**LEAVE THE PFD ALONE!! We will see you at the ballot box.**

And quit spending money!! Cut cut cut! Let me tell you. MANY OF US HAVE HAD TO DO EXACTLY THAT in order to survive. WHY do you want to penalize us through HJR23 for doing what you should be doing? When times are tough you do without! Just like us. Common sense.

**Jeff and Sandy May**

---

Please vote NO on HJR23. it is against the will of the people.

Thank you,

**Susan Coltellaro  
Fairbanks, AK**

---

How many times do your constituents need to vote on this. Leave the PFD alone and start doing your job by cutting spending and government waste! Represent the wishes of those who voted you in to represent them or leave the job and let someone else take your place whose willing to do the hard work and get something accomplished during this session!

**Roselyn Calinoff**

---

Here is my two minutes:

This is yet another political chess maneuver to disguise your opening yet another door to gain access to the PFD money. This is nothing but a stealth ploy to baffle the general population so that you can get one step closer to taking the entire PFD monies available right after the 2018 elections. Then ya'll will have two years to convince the general population that you are really trying to conduct State Government in the best interest of all Alaskans. Let's cut the 'Bravo Sierra' and just take the entire State budget amount that ya'll have inflated, through many additional frivolous amendments, from the PFD funds and quit dragging out the process. Since ya'll are convinced that we can live without our annual PFD dividends, just rip off the band aid and be done with it. But, then, maybe that's not a good idea with reelections just around the corner.

**Randy Bjorgan  
Anchorage AK 99504-3847**

---

Good afternoon.

I am writing in complete opposition to HJR23, and to any other measure that attempts to enshrine the Permanent Fund Dividend (PFD) in our Constitution. Enshrining the Permanent Fund into our Constitution decades ago so that our oil wealth could provide for future Alaskans collective needs was a brilliant idea. Unfortunately, the subsequent use of some of the earnings to provide a cash payment via the PFD check has created an entitlement mentality for many Alaskans who are unable to differentiate between the Permanent Fund, its intended purpose, and the PFD.

The entitlement to a PFD check has no place in our Constitution. I object to the enshrinement of any PFD program in the Constitution, whether it be for 100 percent of the income available for distribution as some members of the public desire, 50 percent of this income as Senators Wielechowski champions through SJR01, 33 percent of this income as provided for in this amended resolution, or 0.0000001 percent of this income which would be a more appropriate value if the PFD actually was to be enshrined in the constitution. Simply put, the entitlement to any PFD check has no place in our Constitution. At best the PFD program should compete with all other State programs and funding needs on an annual basis. My belief is there should be no PFD paid unless a surplus of monies exist after the government that Alaskans collectively require is paid for.

I find it difficult to understand how the House Majority could seek to pass HJR23, especially at a time when the Permanent Fund would have a difficult time paying for the services that Alaskans collectively seek. I believe the PFD program should end until such a time that the Permanent Fund earnings in combination with income from our natural resources can pay for the government services that Alaskans collectively desire.

My belief is that the body of HJR23 should be utilized for creating changes in the Statutes that are applicable to the Permanent Fund and to the PFD program, not for changes to our Constitution. I am amazed that the House Majority has not already started down this path with more than half of this legislative session behind us. It is clear that the House Majority has failed to take the hard steps needed to address our funding problems, and instead desires to hide behind this resolution and your desire to implement an income tax so that you can continue to issue a PFD check that is larger than we can afford.

In summary, I totally oppose any effort to enshrine the PFD in our Constitution. I do so with an understanding of our Constitution, the intended purpose of the Permanent Fund and the earnings derived from it, and an awareness of the financial situation that the State of Alaska is in.

Thank you for this opportunity to testify!

Don Fritz

---

Leave our Permanent Fund alone!! Cut spending and quit spending our money on useless frivolous items. So tired of study after study for no end results.

Take responsibility for this mess and fix it without stealing any more of the peoples money!!

Neva R Mills

Fairbanks, AK

---

Comments of  
Alaskans for Sustainable Budgets  
On HJR 23  
March 12, 2018

This is to provide comments on HJR 23 on behalf of Alaskans for Sustainable Budgets. Established in 2012, Alaskans for Sustainable Budgets is a non-partisan effort working to ensure a sound state fiscal structure and strong economy for this and future Alaska generations.

In preparing our comments we have reviewed both the original version of HJR 23 and the proposed (Work Draft) Committee Substitute (CS) published yesterday afternoon. The CS is a substantially watered down version of the original resolution.

I. Position

We oppose the version reflected in the CS for three reasons: (1) the portion of the draw allocated to the PFD is less than 50% and, in the CS, left entirely uncertain; (2) the draw rate (5% in the original version; 4.75% in the CS) is fixed, which we believe is inappropriate for a Constitutional provision; and (3) in any given year the legislature is permitted to withdraw more than the draw rate.

We would support HJR 23 if amended to: (1) provide for a firm PFD (“shall distribute”) equal to 50% of the draw rate; (2) provide for a draw rate equal to the real rate of return realized on the invested assets averaged over the preceding five (or 10) years; (3) provide for neither a minimum nor maximum PFD; and (4) provide for legislative confirmation of members of the Permanent Fund Board.

II. Reasons

The reasons for our positions follow:

*PFD allocation* : According to two recent studies from the University of Alaska-Anchorage’s Institute of Social and Economic Research (ISER), cutting the PFD has the “largest adverse impact”<sup>1</sup> on the overall economy, and is “by far the costliest to Alaska

<sup>1</sup> ISER, *Short-run Economic Impacts of Alaska Fiscal Options* (March 2016) at p. A-15.

Page 1

families”<sup>2</sup> of all of the various new revenue alternatives they studied. Put another way, *all* of the other new revenue alternatives ISER studied have a lower adverse impact and are less costly for Alaska families than cutting the PFD. No studies have refuted those conclusions.

*If* there is a need for new revenues, the Legislature and Governor should look to those which have a lower adverse impact than cutting the PFD. (We are prepared to support a broad based flat tax).<sup>3</sup> Especially in the midst of a recession, we see *no* justification

from a fiscal or economic perspective for weakening the overall Alaska economy and imposing additional costs on Alaska families when lower impact alternatives are available.

For the same reason, we believe that the PFD should be certain and based on the “shall be transferred” standard reflected in the original version of HJR 23 instead of the “may be appropriated” standard contained in the CS. Not distributing a full PFD is the same as cutting it in order to raise new revenue. If there is a need for new revenue it should be raised through less economically harmful means. Given its economic role and importance, the PFD -- and the contribution it makes to the overall economy and Alaska families -- should not be left to government whim.

*Draw rate:* Constitutional provisions should be designed to be workable and durable over an extended period and in a large variety of situations. As we have seen with the changes made in the draw rate just between the original version of HJR 23 and the CS, market conditions -- which form the basis for the draw rate -- can change significantly over time. Including a fixed draw rate in the Constitution could become highly problematic as changes in market conditions during future periods lead others -- and should lead Alaska -- to adopt significantly higher or lower levels.

The establishment of a draw rate usually is based on the “real” rate of return<sup>4</sup> expected to be achieved over time. Rather than setting the best current guess in concrete in the Constitution, we recommend instead using as the draw rate for each year the actual, average real rate of return realized over the prior five years (5-year trailing average). As the proposed provision does with market value, using an averaged real rate of return should smooth out any periodic aberrations. If there is a concern that five years is too

<sup>2</sup> ISER, [How Much Might Closing the State Budget Gap Cost Alaska Families?](#) (Feb. 2017) at p. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Alaskans for Sustainable Budgets, [Notes from the Alaska Fiscal Cliff: Our Proposed Fiscal Solution](#) (Nov. 2017).

<sup>4</sup> The “real” rate of return on an investment is the realized rate of return, less inflation. Investopedia, [What is a 'Real Rate Of Return'.](#)

Page 2

short a period for establishing the real rate of return to be used for purposes of establishing the annual draw rate, we could support instead either the use of a 10-year trailing average, or the use of a 10-year period composed of the past 5 years and the rate projected by the Permanent Fund Board, upon advice of their advisors, for the following five years (which is the basis for the currently proposed 4.75%).

*No minimum or maximum PFD:* While deleted in the CS, the original version contained a minimum PFD of \$1,250.<sup>5</sup> We agree with the deletion and believe that both the PFD and government shares of the draw (what Governor Hammond referred to as the “other half”) should be set by actual performance, rather than by arbitrary collars. As Alaska transitions to a fiscal and economic structure significantly influenced by Permanent Fund performance, the PFD and government shares should reflect actual rather than artificial results. Basing the PFD and government shares on artificial results resulting from outdated or non-market driven numbers could lead to either bubbles or artificial depressions in the Alaska economy.

*Limiting the draw:* The CS contains a provision which would enable the legislature to withdraw more from the earnings reserve in any given year than provided by the draw rate.<sup>6</sup> We believe that is inappropriate.

The Permanent Fund is meant for both current and future Alaska generations. Consistent with that principle, once converted to a POMV approach each generation should be permitted to take only its share of revenues determined by that approach. Allowing one generation to take more than its allocated share by taking more from the earnings reserve than results from the draw rate necessarily will come at the expense of future generations. Such intergenerational raids should be prohibited, not enabled, by the Constitution.

*Requiring confirmation of Permanent Fund Board members:* As noted above, Alaska is in the process of transitioning to a fiscal and economic structure that will be significantly influenced by Permanent Fund performance. Just as the Constitution requires legislative confirmation of other positions playing such a role in Alaska government,<sup>7</sup> it should do the same with the Permanent Fund Board. Doing so provides an additional check and balance on the quality and knowledge base of those that serve in the role.

<sup>5</sup> [HJR023A](#) at proposed Art. IX, Sec. 15 (c).

<sup>6</sup> [CS for House Joint Resolution No. 23 \(FIN\) \(Work Draft\)](#) at proposed Art. IX, Sec. 15(e).

<sup>7</sup> See, e.g., [Art. 3, Section 26](#).

---

Any politician that supports HJR23 should be ashamed of themselves. As Alaskans we gave up or lost our mineral rights this is our compensation. I've liver in Homer Alaska my entire life and I have seen our wasteful spending, it's time it stops! The last thing we need to do is pull more money out of hard working Alaskans pockets. I support SJR1

Kiel Moe  
Homer, ak 99603

---

To Whom This May Concern,  
I am in strong favor toward protecting the PFD for the citizens of Alaska in the AK Constitution. As a small business owner I have seen the benefits of the PFD on our local economy, not to mention the wisdom our forefathers had in creating the PFD in the first place. I strongly resent the government's attempts to use the money to make up for their inability to work within their own budget and will stand behind those in favor of protecting it for our children, grandchildren, and many generations to come. The mineral rights belong to all Alaskans, and as such, we deserve our portion of the dividends from the wise investment of income from those minerals.

Thank you for considering and standing with Alaskans in this important issue!

Sincerely,

Megan Knapp  
Small business owner, mother and Alaskan resident

---

This is to tell the legislators to keep their hands off our PFD  
Joel Jackson

---

Hello,

In regards to HJR23...

I want it to be on record that my preference for the PFD is for 100% be given to the residence of Alaska, and written into the State Constitution as such.

Now, realizing that that is probably unacceptable to the people in Alaskan Gov.... I want to state that I request the PFD split be 50/50 and be written into the State Constitution to secure it.

respectfully,  
Heather Kinnowr

---

The format of the PFD should not be changed except to guarantee all of it is paid out to the people of Alaska and not the government. The Alaska government should start their own Permanent fund and then live of a percentage of that funds earnings. We know that is a sound model.

Thank you Tammie,

Roger Evans

---

I do not support House Resolution HJR23 in its current form. This resolution opens the door in the future to plunder the last good thing our state government has not broken. The PFD.

Cut some spending in the capital budget. The latest draft I have seen has zero real cuts in the next round of state spending.

Try harder.

Regards,

Bryan R. Martin  
Chugiak, AK 99567

---

Please do not pass HJR 23 bill, this affects the PFD on the way it was originally set up for the Alaskan people @50/50.

Sally Johnson

---

Please do not pass HJR 23 as it is presently worded. HJR 23 needs to be changed to reflect the 50/50 split, and guaranteed by the Constitution. Ed Flanders

I am against the bill that lets the state gov get their hands on even more of the pfd!

I'm against what Walker and others have done to get the amount of the pfd to this point.

Taking the pfd away and putting a cap on it so the ppl don't get above a certain amount, will not help the economy.

I am against the hjr 23, and against changing the original pfd.

Sincerely;  
Holly A. Ridenour

---

My name is Susan L. Brown and I am a registered Alaskan voter and have lived in Alaska for almost 30 years. I am currently on a fixed Social Security Income. The Permanent Fund Dividend has been a yearly blessing to help prepare for winter especially for those on limited income. It also is a provision for people/families to travel to lower 48 that is often not in the

every day budget. There are lots of other benefits to families for saving for education and other opportunities.

I do not support the endorsement of HJR23 (CONST AM: PERMANENT FUND; POMV; DIVIDEND)

In my opinion, the Permanent Fund was originally set up for the people of Alaska and though needs of our state have changed, the original mandate for the Permanent Fund should remain the same and be followed according to what was originally mandated OR **any amendment or new mandate should be subject to voter ballot only** not to the legislature or the current administration's prerogative without voter ballot approval or to limit a ballot amendment be framed prescribed formula by the legislature or the current administration.

I submit this email for Public Testimony today March 12, 2018 on HJR23

Susan L. Brown  
North Pole, AK 99705

---

I am against giving more to the state gov! Anything less than 50/50 ppl/gov ratio is not acceptable. Changes made to take away even more would be hard to fix later, and the gov always finds a way to make sure they keep their hands in the pockets of money once they've gotten their hands in the pockets.

I am against the 33/67 split the gov is trying to get now.

I'm against what's been done by Walker so far, and I'm against more being taken. I'm also against permanent changes to make it where the gov can permanently keep their hands on the money.

Holly A. Ridenour  
fbks, ak 99712

---

am writing to express my concerns over HJR23. The PFD wasn't created to fund the government or government operations and trying to change its original purpose is wrong. It's stealing from hardworking Alaskans who rely on it to help alleviate Alaska's high living costs. Our economy is struggling and taking that money out of the economy won't do our state any favors. A strong government means nothing when the people are struggling. There have not been adequate cuts to state government employees. Salaries should be looked at, and reorganizations need to be made within state departments before the government starts taking money that was designed to go to Alaskans.

The Permanent Dividend Fund is not the governments money. It is the people's royalties as we are shareholders of the land and resources. The Permanent Dividend Fund should not be part of the budget. The people should be able to decide what to do with their royalties. Return what was withheld from my family 2016 and 2017 Dividend.

House Joint Resolution 23 because it ignores the basic premise as to why Alaska has a sovereign wealth fund. The Permanent Fund was established as a financial vehicle to allow Alaskans the opportunity to share in the benefit of the use of our commonly owned resources. HJR-23 proposes to fundamentally change how this is done, thus reducing the benefit to Alaskans by allowing our government to take more from the private economy to fund an ever expanding government. This bill almost completely ignores the current statutes regarding how the dividend is calculated while ensuring that government is allowed the lion's share of the earnings to spend on deficit budgeting.

Reginald Swedberg

I am completely against this and any other legislation by the administration or the legislature that pillages the permanent fund. The legislature continually fails to do its job. Try doing what normal people do when it comes to budgeting. Build a budget based on the amount of income you have. Once you attempt this, then you can begin to show me why you need more money to operate the government. Only then will I begin to entertain any idea of allowing you to use the permanent fund.

Timothy P. Harris  
Palmer, AK 99645

---

Representative Wilson,

Regrettably I'm unable to testify by phone or in person regarding HNR23. I have to work to support my family while y'all are supposedly giving all Alaskans a chance to be heard.

Thank you for posting on Facebook and saying you will get emails sent to you entered into the record.

The State of Alaska does not need to cut or restrict the PFD at this time, nor do they need to deplete the Permanent Fund Corpus.

Over the last 3 years I've given the Administration multiple plans that would cut spending without cutting services. My ideas were dismissed as being to small to make a difference. \$10 million or more is a large amount to a working person like me. I've tried to give some of these ideas to various legislators only to be told they are something the Administration did do without legislation or worse yet, it's to late now act on the ideas.

Untill the State consolidates a travel plan and negotiates for lower hotel, and rental car rates they haven't cut enough spending. Until the State tells Alaska Air to either cut rates or the State will use all other airlines for out if State travel they hadn't cut enough.

Unroll the State consolidates all purchasing departments into one thus using bulk purchasing to save money they haven't cut spending.

The State should mandate that the UA system consolidate purchasing for the same reasons. They should mandate that degrees not be offered at all 3 major campuses rather 1 ca.pus has a spisisfic degree if a person wants that degree they must attend that campus.

Rural school districts should be consolidated to eliminate duplication of administrative staff... this alone would save millions of dollars in the State education budget.

I'm aware of at least 3plans to cut State Healthcare Spending WITHOUT REDUCING SERVISES yet the State has chosen not to act.

I urge you the House, Senate and Administration to implement the above ideas as well as many others that will cut spending without reducing services

Then and only then will I support a change to the Permanent Fund and the PFD. Until then pay the PFD as per the Statute that was in effect prior to 2016.

Respectfully  
Michael Jesperson  
Anchorage.

---

Please accept the following testimony to be entered into public record for regarding HJR23:

I oppose House Joint Resolution 23. The Permanent Fund was established to allow Alaskans the opportunity to share from the financial benefit of the use of our commonly owned natural resources. HJR23 is a proposal to significantly change how this is done to the detriment of individual Alaskans by allowing the government to take more from the individual to fund an ever-growing, and unfortunately, inefficient government.

Failure to set a realistic budget and hold to it when times are lean is not how you manage a business, let alone state government. Fundamentally restructuring the calculations of the PFD to move the majority share to a government that has shown it will not make the tough budgetary decisions required to effectively manage the state's financial shortages will not fix Alaska's financial issues. Stripping the budget to necessary services and cutting the nice-to-haves is long overdue. The Alaska House of Representatives should join in supporting Senate Joint Resolution 1 in letting Alaskan citizens have a voice in determining what happens our resources.

Respectfully,  
Karen Tomasik  
Two Rivers, Alaska

---

Thank you for taking and listening to my testimony.

Government is out of control with its spending and needs to be cut to coincide with our dwindling economy. As it stands now government continually takes from the people of the state of Alaska and sends the message that government knows how to spend the people's money better than the people do. This isn't so. All forms of government is failing even in this state. The fish and game continually turn a blind eye to over harvesting by large commercial fishing and now it writes and enforces all these restrictive rules and regulations on the average people of Alaska who actually own the resources of the state and are trying to put food in their freezers. This keeps them in many cases from even going out and trying. Because of the over abundance of restrictions and laws even people working at and for the fish and game can't interpret them the same way leaving the person trying to follow the law at a loss of knowing what to do. In reality it's all because of the shortfall caused by bad management by government. This is only one example and there are many. We don't need more of this. As far as for means my family I have one child in college and the pfd could definitely be used better to further educate her as a future citizen and leader in the state then for the government to keep overspending with much of it abused and mismanaged and always needing more. Enough is enough. Thank you for your time.

Keep looking up!!!  
Andy Cizek

---

I am a hard working mother of 5, I work fulltime, pay my bills and take of what needs to be done. I object to this HJR23 and ask that the current PFD calculation be put into the constitution. You are taking away from my family. I live pay check to pay check and pay my bills. I don't understand why you need to STEAL from the people of alaska when in reality cuts need to be made or over spending on waste needs to stop.

Thank you,  
Stacy Turner  
Anchorage, Alaska

---

I oppose HJR 23. There is no reason to change the way the PFD is calculated when you, the government legislators, have yet to make any significant changes in the current level of government spending. This bill is just another easy way for you to avoid doing your jobs and taking money that you have no business trying to take.

Again, I strongly oppose HJR 23. Any of you voting in favor of this will not get my vote for re-election.

Sincerely,  
Raylene Sinnett

---

This so called bill that will add the PFD to the AK Constitution is **TOTALLY WRONG**. We know this is a money grab and an venue for Walker and the State to seek additional control on the fund. You are actually wasting your time for Dunlevy will repeal it for since it is not in the best interest of the People.

Furthermore, you have not right to tax us or change the equation of the PFB with out the vote of the People.

Before you continue to steal and threaten us you need to do your job and cut the budget. Currently the Medicaid budget is winding down so rather shoveling money you need to re negotiate contracts for lower prices and cut participants. Next then enact the ability to purchase insurance across state lines.

Bottom line you will feel the pain come election. FIRE WALKER for he is a Dictator and is screwing the State of AK for his own interest. Working with China is going to destroy us and is in conflict with DOD.

Have a great day!  
Dixie D. Banner

---

I think HJR is a terrible idea. The state is badly in need of revenue sources to carry out its functions. HJR i23 is a step in the **WRONG** direction. Please kill it..

Dan Swift  
Fairbanks 99701

---

Please leave the PFD alone. It stimulates the economy every year. Helps with heating oil bills and electric bill every winter. The pick click, give , program has suffered the last 2 years.

It needs to remain in its original form, period.

We are so fortunate to have this program.

I urge all Representatives and Senators to strongly oppose this bill.

KILL. The bill. HJR23 and have a public voice on SJR1 and get it out of committee.

Thanks' Mike Wallin

---

March 12, 2018

Members of the Finance Committee,  
I am Pamela Goode from Greater Deltana;  
I oppose HJR23.

This bill does nothing to address the root of the problem that has brought Alaska to the financial challenges she faces today. For the past, almost 40 years, the current calcualtion of the PFD has never been an issue. The phrase, "Never let a good crisis go to waste" is upon us hiding in plain view.

This current fiscal hurdle was developed and designed by excessive wasteful government spending and the inability to stop. Until this has been addressed, a POMV or any other structural funding change will only exacerbate the true infliction. These tactics will further erode savings unnecessarily as has been done to the billions of dollars that once resided in the SBR and CBR. The insatiable appetite of the goverment is without bounds that has proven to work against a free people.

The legislatures and Governors over the past decade have failed miserably in their duties of fiscal responsibility and good stewardship. Trust has been violated beyond mend.

I encourage you all to focus on your oaths of office. In so doing, the problems before you will be solved without inflicting further damage and pain on the liberties and rights of the people you have been hired to protect.

I do not support a POMV. I do not support tampering with the PFD's traditional calculation and distribution as originally designed. I do not support HJR23.

That concludes my testimony.

Pamela Goode

---

I strongly urge you to represent the people and protect our fund. In college I had the opportunity to get first hand history from one of the legislators who set the permanent fund into existence. Former legislator, Ron Larson, spoke with pride of how the fund wad set aside and protected for future generations from spending. It was never supposed to be a bank account for the politicians to tap.

I urge you to uphold the intent of the fund. Stop capping our funds illegally.

Cut your own pay, per diems, insurance, retirements before cutting peoples fund. Move the capital to a road system city. which was voted on more than once. Why didn't this happen, people always lining their pockets. Close the capital snd outsource to china if it saves us from all this excessive spending, its out of control.

Elizabeth Dennis  
Palmer, Ak 99645

---

Opposing this measure completely!!

Calling for you all to step up and protect the shareholders, the people of Alaska.  
I vote.

Janine Thompson  
Fbks 99712

---

12 March, 2018

I oppose HJR023 and any other attempt to steal funds from the people and distribute them to the government so long as the government has failed to limit itself to a constitutionally mandated balanced budget and to demonstrate the ability to reign in unnecessary wasteful spending. The Legislature and Governor have shown no interest in forcing restraint upon themselves, only on forcing the citizenry to pay for things that the government has no rightful business spending on.

I urge all sitting members of the Legislature to vote against further attempts to appropriate more funding, but rather to reduce spending.

Regards,  
Michael Mastin  
Ketchikan, AK

---

Jeff Taylor here,

55 years in Alaska, on Anderson City Council, Vice Mayor, single father of a 5 year old. Much rather see taxes that effect everyone than stealing our PFD that helps every single Alaskan!

So disappointed.

---

Please leave the permanent fund alone.

You are attempting to rob it to be blunt.

The PFD was started in 1976, been doing well for 40 plus years We do not need more government...period

Thank you

Rick Williams /. KGB

---

Dear Persons:

As written, I am 100% against HJR23. The way this bill is written guarantees more and more dollars to run government AND, at best, a more or less flat rate PFD. The use of the word "may" appropriate for the funds to be distributed to Alaskans versus the word "shall" for funds going to government is an insult to every citizen of this state. Go with the Hammond 50/50% model and equal (legal) language throughout. Submit HJR23 as written to the people and we will thoroughly reject it. Then we vote most of you out of office.

Johnny Murdock

---