

hello mr. thomas, co-chair of the house finance.....since the senate bill 23 had passed in the senate and now goes to the house....it's hb 67.....it's about the movie productions.....i would ,as well the deaf population ,....suggest your finance committe insert including "closed captioning" in all movie productions when made in alaska unjfortunately, right now "big miracle" does not include the closed captioning.....i already contacted matt at the senator ellis' office of our concerns.....i hope matt will contact you after he talks with senator ellis.....

by the way, i tried to contact your office and left a message re: closed captioning to be inserted in both the senate 23 and the house 67.....

i would appreciate it very much if you acknowlege the above message.....

thanking you very much in advance, i am

sincerely yours,

albert berke

9131 centennial circle 107a

anchorage, alaska 99504-1482

[aberke2@juno.com](mailto:aberke2@juno.com)

Carol Jensen  
10821 Baronik Street  
Anchorage, AK 99516  
Phone: 907-562-3200 Ext 111  
Cell: 907-244-1979  
Email: vegas.girl@yahoo.com

**FAX MESSAGE**

March 27, 2012

**To:** House Finance Committee Members, Fax #907-465-6813

**RE: CSSB 23 Film Contract Credits**

**Total number of pages including this cover sheet: 1**

Dear Members:

I am opposed to the continuation of this large credit. My reasons include:

1. The \$200 million could be better used to directly benefit residents in-state.
2. \$200 million is double what was previously allotted. What justification is there for doubling the amount?
3. I do not believe the direct benefit to Alaskans when a film crew is working in the state comes close to the \$200 million or even \$100 million credit amount.
4. The bill calls for auditing the books and accounts for this program only once every 3 years. That leaves a lot of time for unrecognized errors and possible fraud.
5. The section that lists costs incurred in state that are eligible for the credit is far too broad. The following numbered items have absolutely no benefit to the state or any of our citizens, since those jobs, services, activities, etc. would not require or utilize local companies or citizens: #1-5, #9, #10, #14, #15, #16. I am particularly opposed to the credit being extended for salaries and taxes on vehicle rentals or lodging #10 and #15).
6. Allowing the time to use the certificates for up to six years is also unnecessary and not beneficial to the state.

If film companies want to film in our state, they should be welcome to do so; however, not at the expense of the public. This \$200 million could be put to much better use, or better yet, SAVED for our future, which is not looking too bright from a fiscal standpoint.

This bill is yet another example of a flagrant waste of public money. Please do not move this bill.

Thank you.



Carol Jensen