-----Original Message-----
From: Marna Sanford [redacted]
Sent: Saturday, July 31, 2021 1:58 PM
To: Fiscal Policy <fiscal.policy@akleg.gov>
Cc: Rep. Grier Hopkins <Rep.Grier.Hopkins@akleg.gov>; Sen. Robert Myers <Senator.Robert.Myers@akleg.gov>
Subject: Fiscal policy

Constitutionalizing the dividend isn't the worst idea, constitutionalizing the formula is. Please don't do this.

If you don't want to tax Alaskans or oil and you have no detailed plan on the types of cuts that would be necessary to enact the Governors proposal, then that's not a plan, that's a sound byte.

I believe you are smart and thoughtful. Please - there is a path here. Compromise and work hard. We are counting on you to find a way to a solution.

Marna Sanford

From: Jim [redacted]
Sent: Saturday, July 31, 2021 2:13 PM
To: Fiscal Policy <fiscal.policy@akleg.gov>
Subject: I support the full PFD according to original formula.

WHY:
1. Using the PFD earnings to fund government.. results in multiple PFD dividends being paid to state government employees, the Governor and legislators.

1.1 At the expense of new born babies and the rest of Alaskans regardless of race, geographic location, political stroke, or socioeconomic status.

There is not one single school teacher, University of Alaska employee, or legislator worthy of more than one PFD check.

2. Some voters think "government" is worthy of PFD earnings.

I don't have the slightest objection to a PFD application having check off box: "I here by donate my PFD to the "PFD General fund"

People who want the PFD money can campaign for their slice via the legislature dividing up the "PFD General fund" money donated via the check off box.

3. The PFD earnings per the state constitution are the property of the people.

3.1 NOT self-serving predatory interest groups.

4. I campaigned for the PF and PFD when it was set up by Gov. Hammond because: government spending DOES NOT benefit all of us equally in a known and measurable way.

5. We have had 7 arsons in this area. The victims will benefit in a known and measurable way from the PFD.

Sincerely Yours,

Jim Weidner
A friend of the PF and PFD since it was created.

[redacted]
Fairbanks, AK 99712
[redacted]

From: Linda Kruger [redacted]
Sent: Saturday, July 31, 2021 2:17 PM
To: Fiscal Policy <fiscal.policy@akleg.gov>
Cc: Sen. Jesse Kiehl <Sen.Jesse.Kiehl@akleg.gov>
Subject: Increase Revenues Not Cuts

Honorable Members of the Alaska Legislature:

Alaskan seniors want to stay in Alaska as we age. To be able to do so the State budget shortfall must be addressed; new revenues are needed to continue to provide the state infrastructure and services that Alaskans need to allow them to remain in their communities as they age. AARP Alaska surveyed member support for five potential solutions to our state's fiscal challenges: budget cuts, a statewide sales tax, a statewide income tax, increasing oil & gas taxes, and capping the Permanent Fund Dividend (PFD). The recently released survey clearly shows that a majority of older Alaskans oppose cuts to state services and programs to help balance the state budget.

I'm your constituent and I'm asking you to support revenue solutions not more cuts to state services.

After years of reduced spending on services and programs and using the state savings accounts to balance its budget, Alaska must increase revenues or risk losing our seniors as we retire.

Alaska has the fastest growing senior population in the country. The workforce that built the pipeline and our economy are choosing to stay in state as we age.

Every other state has a broad-based tax and it's time that Alaska does again too. As you consider fiscal plan options, please support revenue solutions not continued cuts to services that Alaskan elders value and need.

Thank you.

Linda Kruger
[redacted]
Juneau AK, 99801-1930

-----Original Message-----
From: DOUGLAS MERTZ [redacted]
Sent: Saturday, July 31, 2021 2:28 PM
To: Fiscal Policy <fiscal.policy@akleg.gov>
Subject: Testimony re Fiscal Plan

Please add this to the public testimony on the fiscal plan:

1. A fair tax would tax out-of-state workers who earn money here but do not pay taxes. This is largely oilfield workers, some commercial fishermen, snd some seasonal tour operators and vessels. An income tax should capture these people and companies as taxpayers.

2. The plan should be progressive, that is, the more one earns, the heavier the burden. For instance, the old state income tax which was a percentage of the federal income tax, would put less burden on poor and middle class earners.

3. The new income should be sufficient, when combined with Permanent Fund earnings, to fund basic state services and those budget items that are critical to our future, including education at all levels including the university, public safety, the marine transportation system, and environmental safety. After that, excess revenue can be used for a PFD, but the PFD must come after the basic services.

This is no time to be short-sighted. Please pay attention to Alaska's future.

From: Sen. Jesse Kiehl <Sen.Jesse.Kiehl@akleg.gov>
Sent: Saturday, July 31, 2021 2:41 PM
To: Fiscal Policy <fiscal.policy@akleg.gov>
Subject: Fwd: budget balancing

Mr. Dunker asked me to forward this to the group.

- Jesse

Alaska State Sen. District Q

Juneau, Haines, Skagway, Gustavus, Klukwan

Begin forwarded message:

From: John Dunker & Amy Paige [redacted]
Date: July 29, 2021 at 19:08:46 PDT
To: "Sen. Jesse Kiehl" <Sen.Jesse.Kiehl@akleg.gov>
Subject: budget balancing

Sen. Kiehl:

I favor a progressive income tax. A flat tax is not progressive. Those with incomes less than mine should pay at lower tax rate (with non-discretionary income exempted, or all income less than a "livable" income exempted); those with higher incomes should pay at a higher tax rate. Investment income should not be taxed at a lower rate than income from labor.

I appreciate the work you (and your staff) are doing.

John Dunker, Juneau