

Daniel George

From: warmth@alaskafireplace.com
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2016 2:33 PM
To: Senate State Affairs; warmth@alaskafireplace.com
Subject: PFD

Please figure how you can do fiscal policy without the use of our PFD.

YOU DO NOT HAVE MY VOTE.

DO NOT USE PFD.

You have selected way too many ways to spend State of Alaska monies for much foolishness.

Get back to eating moldy bread and learn how to live on a real budget like all entrepreneurs have to do to stay alive.

If we cannot pay our bills we don't eat or go broke.

No luxury here no \$100,000+++ salaries with benefits.

A great salary is \$45,000. That's what I make and have to pay my bills with.

The PFD helps me and my small business a lot.

Get rid of the UNIONS!!!!

Live within your means.

No free ride.

Dan Michaud, President

Alaska Fireplace & Accessories, Inc.

P.O. Box 873161

Wasilla, Alaska 99687

907-892-7131

Daniel George

From: Daniel Hamm <daniel_hamm@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 16, 2016 8:23 PM
To: Senate State Affairs
Subject: SB 114 Testimony

Public Testimony on SB 114

I'm against SB 114 for three reasons:

First, SB 114 amounts to regressive tax that would most hurt the poorest of all Alaskan's most.

Alaska's statehood compact restricts private individuals from owning mineral rights. The PFD is a way of righting that wrong and allowing individual Alaskan's to share in Alaska's mineral rights. By changing the PFD calculation assumptions, this could amount to a tax of over 75% on each Alaskan dividend check.

- One can argue the public unions have legally binding contracts that call for regular step and COLA increases and that government must take it from the private sector with low oil revenue.
- You have a contract to represent the non-government sector who elected you. Who is watching out for your constituents financial well-being? Because they can't use tax dollars to lobby to use the law against another sector of the economy does that make them second-class citizens?

Secondly, SB 114 is a permanent fix to temporary problem.

- Oil prices are constantly changing with changes in supply and demand. It was a huge mistake to steadily increase state spending from 2006 onward in response to high oil prices.
- It is also the exact same mistake to permanently remove money from the private sector economy and plug it into the post-bubble public sector economy in response to a regular oil price trough.

Thirdly, Alaska's state government is way too big and it spends too much.

- Most agree that Alaska has the most bloated state government in the nation that must streamline itself with the drop in oil prices as the big three oil companies have already done.
- Focusing on revenue increases before making meaningful cuts attempts to delay or eliminate this streamlining that must inevitably take place.

In conclusion, it is morally wrong to prop up a bloated state government by taking money out of the private sector economy as this bill would do.

Regards,

Daniel Hamm

Daniel George

From: JimW <2jweid@alaska.net>
Sent: Friday, February 19, 2016 4:19 PM
To: Senate State Affairs
Subject: Raiding the Permanent Fund comments

February 19, 2016

Fairbanks, Alaska

4:16 PM

To: Comments PF <SenateStateAffairs@akleg.gov>

Dear legislators,

Comments on SB 128 PERM. FUND:DEPOSITS;DIVIDEND;EARNINGS (Sponsored by the Governor)

Comments on SB 114 PERM FUND: EARNINGS, DEPOSITS, ACCOUNTS (Sponsored by Senator McGuire)

For those of you who defend the Permanent Fund:

Not only are you NOW defending the Permanent Fund from being raided this year. Your defending against future raiding.

According to the newspaper, the dividends are expected to be the same amount for the next couple of years – in other words, \$2000 this fall \$2000 next fall. And maybe another \$2000. The next full.

If one of the voters in your district has a family of four – two adults and two kids you're talking \$8000 this year \$8000 the year after this and \$8000 the year after that.

In other words, you're protecting \$24,000 worth of cash and come in the next three years to that individual voters family.

There are some reasons to defend the Permanent Fund:

1) 83% of us voted NO to raiding the Permanent Fund,

2) No is NO and we still mean NO because the dividends are the essential to the economy, Alaska.

3) It is the only thing that benefits each of us fairly and equally regardless of race, economic status, or physical location.

Therefore, I urge these two bills to be killed in committee so that they never see the light of day again.

Sincerely yours,

"A friend of the dividend"

Jim Widener
5479 Chena Hot Springs Rd.
Fairbanks, Alaska 99712

verification phone number 488-6366

PS: I have lived in Alaska nearly 44 years and I helped establish the Permanent Fund and especially the dividend program. It is the one and only thing that is benefited all of us equally from the oil wealth and the oil boom.

It is a trust fund set up to last for in perpetuity providing dividends to the people of Alaska.

You legislators are trustees --- not representatives some predatory interest group that thinks they should get more than one dividend check--in some cases 50 – 60 and up dividend checks EACH.

Daniel George

From: Dan Owens <alaskalogger@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2016 8:23 AM
To: Sen. Bill Stoltze
Subject: Budget

Dear Sir,

I am writing to give my thoughts on the budget discussions going on in Juneau. There are three points that I would like to discuss.

1. There are no real cuts to spending included in any of the proposals. There is too much "fat" in our state government. Budgets have been set at revenues from record high oil prices at the \$100/ barrel level. These budget proposals are nearly the same. We need to write the budget with projections at around \$60/ barrel. We would still have a deficit at this point but there would be a real chance of prices coming back to that level.

The government needs to quit trying to be in business. It seems that every time the state tries to fund a project it fails dismally. Examples are the Point Mackenzie dairy project, Matanuska Maid, Susitna Dam... The list goes on. Now we are set to spend billions on a gas line project. If these projects make sense economically, then business will build them. We can encourage these projects with tax structure but we must stop funding them.

2. If there are new taxes to be imposed then everyone should have to pay them. A sales tax makes more sense to me since it would assess everyone equally including tourists and non-resident workers.

3. If the PFD earnings are taken for government use, the economy will shrink. I think the money will be better spent and do this State more good if left in the hands of the individual.

Thank you for your consideration.

Daniel Owens
Palmer, Alaska

Daniel George

From: David Nelson <dngrizz@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2016 10:54 AM
To: Sen. Bill Stoltze
Subject: Upcoming Budget Voting

Dear Bill,

I am a 23 year resident of Eagle River, a retired military man, and now retired banker. I am longtime supporter and have seen and met you several times through business related meetings.

I am sending this email to voice my opinion against changes to the current PFD distribution procedure, as well as **strongly opposed to any new taxes.**

I believe we have further cuts to social programs to make, as well as a "rainy day" surplus to be used for just this kind of situation.

Thank you for your past efforts and future consideration.

Sincerely,

David G. Nelson
17536 Teklanika Drive
Eagle River, AK
(907) 230-8580

Daniel George

From: eskiles <eskiles@mtaonline.net>
Sent: Tuesday, February 16, 2016 7:56 PM
To: Senate State Affairs
Cc: EdnEllen
Subject: Alaskas budget

Our legislators have been spending like there is no bottom to the money well. I don't want them to drain the PFD because they can't find a better way to fund their pork. Alaska has been a boom bust economy too long. It is time the state creates a profit based economy and uses the profits to fund projects, not possible future funds. We Alaskans have endured hardship from weather, being remote from the rest of the world, and greedy politicians reaping the benefits of the state's resources and not sharing with the people working hard to just survive. If we can't sell the gas and oil we need to use it to power an industrial expansion within the state. We have land we have resources we just need to entice entrepreneurs to build industry here. Using our energy resources at cost to bring profit by expanding business opportunities. Don't let government waste our savings. Insist they pay it back with interest.

Sent from my Samsung device

Daniel George

From: Elderberry-b-b <elderberry-b-b@gci.net>
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2016 7:56 AM
To: Senate State Affairs
Subject: Do not dip into permanent fund

To our elected officials,
It would make more sense to pass a state sales tax!!!

We are senior citizens & are on a limited income. We use our permanent fund to pay our property taxes We are proud to call Alaska our home for 40 years and would like to remain in Alaska. Without our permanent fund we would have to consider moving to the lower 48.

Sent from my iPad

Daniel George

From: Kristi Wood <bikemoredriveless@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 16, 2016 8:27 AM
To: Senate State Affairs
Subject: Please support SB114

Hello Alaska Senate State Affairs Committee,

I am writing to you in support of SB114. I am not an economist, but I've studied the economic data from the Institute of Social and Economic Research (ISER) regarding Alaska's current fiscal crisis. The only logical conclusions I can draw after reviewing this data, is that the legislature must act during this legislative session, and accessing a portion of the Permanent Fund earnings is the single most substantive way to close this gap.

Also, due to the magnitude of the crisis, swift action that includes a portion of the Permanent Fund is the only way to preserve the future of the Permanent Fund. That's because if we do not close the fiscal gap during this legislative session, we risk being forced in to drastic measures in the next two years that could result in significant negative impacts to the Permanent Fund.

I understand the motivation to seek further cuts in spending, however it is irresponsible to focus on cuts alone. The magnitude of this crisis is such that new revenues must be incorporated. As an example, the savings from firing all State employees would not be enough to bridge the fiscal gap, and would also trigger a highly disruptive downturn in Alaska's economy.

While an income tax and revising oil taxes and credits are also important sources of new revenue that must be explored, those revenue sources amount to significantly less than what will be made available to Alaska via SB114. ISER's data shows us that we can only expect roughly 800 million dollars from reorganizing oil taxes and credits, and roughly 650 million from an income tax. Together that amounts to less than half of what we need to close the gap.

By utilizing a portion of the Permanent Fund, SB114 gains us close to 2 billion, closing the gap by half.

I fully respect the concern that capping PFD checks could have a negative impact on some Alaskans who may be counting on that money to make ends meet. However, if we do nothing, we risk losing the PFD checks altogether; that clearly would not be acceptable. SB114 stabilizes PFD checks at a sustainable amount, preserving the Permanent Fund so that it can be, well, permanent. This gives Alaskan families the opportunity to plan and budget according to a set, predictable amount.

In closing I urge your timely support of SB114, as it provides us with a sustainable path forward for securing the future stability of the permanent fund, and also makes substantive progress in closing the enormous fiscal gap.

Respectfully,
Kristi Wood
Anchorage resident

Daniel George

From: Mary Anderson <manderson@acsalaska.net>
Sent: Tuesday, February 16, 2016 8:54 PM
To: LIO Anchorage; Senate State Affairs
Subject: New taxes

To whom it may concern:

I cannot support any new taxes, be they corporate, personal, sales or alcohol, until the PFD is at zero. It is crazy to want more money from businesses and individuals when the permanent fund has money. If you are afraid that residents will be upset, just limit the zero payout to 5 years, extendable for another 5 years or until a barrel of oil is great than \$100.

For those who want a sin tax or any kind, remember that the PFD causes folks to partake of those things considered sinful. Excessive alcohol would be limited if you didn't give out free money. The PFD money does not do many favors, much of the time it is either consumed badly here in state or spent out of state. Where is the good in that?

The State government needs to be right sized, there is lots of waste in the state system – I say this because I worked there. It would seem a 15% cut in total personal and spending would not be that hard to reach. Granted some areas need to a greater reduction and some may need to be preserved, but a 15 percent downsize is not a stretch.

This past summer the news reported the largest capital spending budget ever being spent on road projects. Really? In the face of a recession, didn't anyone know there was a budget shortfall last year. It's that kind of irresponsibility that has put the state where we are. The overspending needs to STOP, and be just a bit responsible.

My bottom line is PFD should be at ZERO before you start piling on new taxes.

Thank you for your time,

Mary Anderson

5840 Azalea Drive

Anchorage, AK

Daniel George

From: Mary Turner <mlaketur@usa.net>
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2016 4:42 AM
To: Sen. Bill Stoltze; Sen. Lesil McGuire
Subject: PFD

Using the PFD Permanent Fund Dividend to solve our fiscal dilemma is like cutting off your nose to spite your face.

According to an ISER (Institute of Social and Economic Research) July, 2010 report, the PFD has the effect of introducing a new industry into and adding stability to the economy. It has lowered the poverty rate, especially in rural areas of the State where jobs are scarce and the cost of living is high.

I can't understand why the Native population that has to rely on subsistence hunting and fishing, isn't up in arms about Gov Walker's proposal.

Besides, it is illogical to expect that once the legislature gets even a part of it, that it will have the discipline to use it wisely. Think Taj Mahal/LIO (Legislative Information Office) that was constructed while facing a huge budget deficit.

It will return to the days where Alaskan generated wealth will go to wealthy non-residents.

Daniel George

From: Philip Treuer <treuer1@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 16, 2016 9:27 PM
To: Senate State Affairs
Subject: State Fiscal Crisis

Dear Senators,

I support legislation to address the state's fiscal crisis this session. While I understand the need to continue looking for ways to cut spending, the crisis can't be resolved solely, or even primarily, through spending cuts. I believe that we also need to look at increasing revenues through taxes, reducing the permanent fund dividend, and saving less. I support SB 114, the Governors proposal, or some other variation of these proposals. Most importantly, I would like to emphasize that the legislature should act now, this session, and not put off important decisions until next year.

Thank you.

Philip Treuer
Anchorage, Alaska

Daniel George

From: Dave Bishop <db7597@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 18, 2016 2:41 AM
To: Senate State Affairs
Subject: Written Testimony In Support Of SB-114

Please accept the following as written testimony in support of Alaska SB-114.

My name is David Bishop and I am registered to vote in Anchorage Alaska.

I attended the public hearing on February 16, 2016. Unfortunately, I had to leave before testifying in support of SB-114.

The reasons for supporting the bill are very clear.

Using a portion of the PFD to reduce the budget has to be a part of any comprehensive solution.

I have seen the full financial analysis and that fact seems to be indisputable.

If everyone understood that fact, passing SB-114 would be very simple.

However, there are those who gave very sincere testimony indicating that they rely on the PFD as part of their household income and as a result - they do not support SB-114.

I would like to provide the perspective that passing SB-114 is actually the best thing for those families who rely on the PFD.

I say that because without SB-114, the PFD fund will actually will actually become extinct.

Although SB-114 reduces the amount each person will receive - it is the only way that seems to preserve the fund for the longer term.

As a result, those families who rely on their PFD checks every year really need SB-114 to pass in order to preserve at least some PFD income.

A reduced PFD check for families that rely on it is far better than receiving no check at all.

I am concerned that those who oppose SB-114 don't really understand the full scope of the financial crisis.

I am concerned that some think the problem will be solved simply by cutting government spending alone.

I am concerned that some don't understand the crisis is real.

I am concerned that many think the problem will just fix itself if oil prices increase.

I am concerned that there will be a rapid loss of jobs as companies are likely forced to downsize.

I'm concerned for the kids of Alaska who will lose their chance to grow up in such a great state if their parents need to leave the state for another job.

For all of those reasons - this is the time we need our state government to lead its citizens.

We need our government to make tough decisions that may be unpopular to some - but that are required to do the right thing for the great state of Alaska and its citizens.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify and thank you for your public service.

Sincerely,
David Bishop
Anchorage, AK

Daniel George

From: Stephen Holmstock <stephenholmstock@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 16, 2016 10:06 PM
To: Senate State Affairs
Subject: SB 114: Sen. Lesil McGuire's SB 114, to use Permanent Fund Earnings, has another public hearing.

Thank you for hearing this.

Every effort needs to be expended to avoid the knee jerk reaction of tapping into the permanent fund.

I say no to this House Bill.

Sincerely

Stephen P Holmstock

(907) 764-6256

Daniel George

From: Terry LaGrone <tlagrone@alumni.caltech.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, February 16, 2016 7:55 PM
To: Senate State Affairs
Subject: Testimony on SB114

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

I support the concept of using more of the funds allocated to the Permanent Fund. The proposal is just a small piece of what must be done to solve our fiscal problems.

This proposed legislation should be combined with other components of the fix to our fiscal crisis.

Additional taxes (income, sales, alcohol, marijuana, etc.) may also be needed.
Reduction of the Permanent Fund Dividend (possibly through an income tax offset) distributed is also required so that all Alaskans can share in supporting the costs of government.

Terry H LaGrone
645 G ST
Anchorage, AK 99501

Deficit

+3 Billion

- I commend the Governor and Some in the legislator with trying to come up with a solution to our serious fiscal problem.
- From what I have been hearing from prominent Alaskans and Academics is that we cannot cut or tax our way out of our current fiscal situation. It sounds like the Permanent Fund will have to be part of the solution.
- We need to put ideology aside, come together as fellow Alaskans and confront this situation now or there are going to be dire consequences soon for all Alaskan.
- To my friends on the left, we cannot continue to support the current state spending as it is now. We need to make some serious cuts to our spending.
- To my friends on the right, we cannot cut our way out of this situation; looks like new revenues are going to have to be part of the solution.
- If we don't do this right, we will send the Alaskan economy into a tail spin. People will be walking away from their homes. Business will fail. Our credit rating will plunge.
- What my fear is, that being an election year, the legislature is going to make excuses that we need to study this problem more, make some cuts around the fringes and kick the can down the road. We have limited reserves and need to act now.
- Personally I think the Governor's proposal using the Permanent fund, cuts, and new revenues gets us closer to closing the gap without dire consequences to the Alaska economy, but SB 114 may be easier for Alaskans to except. So I support either of these proposals or any other reasonable solution.
- The governors pledge to make the hard decisions to confront the crisis even if it means being a one term Governor is commendable. Are you, as our elected officials, willing to make the same pledge even if it might jeopardize your political aspirations?
- I am close to retirement, so I am in a much better position than most to weather the storm. What I worry about is that my children and grandchildren are going to have to move out of state to find economic opportunity and have a reasonably prosperous life.

Thank you all for your time and consideration.

Michael Murphy

Fairbanks, Alaska

mkmurphy@gci.net