

House Finance Committee

Public Testimony HB 3003

Emails received to
HouseFinance@akleg.gov

August 24, 2021
From 3-5pm

Packet 3

From: Barbara Reberg <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:01 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: Alaska Permanent Fund

We are Mike and Barbara Reberg, we live at 189 Blackstone St.
Soldotna, AK

We are sending this email to urge you to please support our
Governor Mr. Dunleavy's plan for the PFD which would include
this year's dividend being \$2350.

We the people are your constituents and we are asking you to
abide by the direction we choose.

Thank you in advance

From: Angelica Hayes <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:02 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: PFD PROPOSAL

To whom it may concern,

I am writing in regards to Governor Dunleavy's PFD proposal of \$2350 I would urge you to please support that proposal! Please vote it through for us. I am one of those Alaskans who has been greatly affected by Covid and I still have not been able to catch up on things. I am in desperate need of a new car. I have no idea where that money is going to come from or how it's going to be done, but I know that PFD is the start and a very helpful one at that. I know others are in the same boat as me. Thank you so much for listening please support Governor Dunleavy's PFD proposal.

Best regards,
Angelica

From: Jessie Bryant <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:03 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: Gov. Dunleavy's PFD Plan-Highly support it!

Hello,

I want to let you know that I am highly in support of Gov. Dunleavy's PFD Plan!

***Sincerely ,
Jessie Bryant
Express Recordings & Services LLC***

From: anton kraskov <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:03 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject:

Support for \$2350 PFD!!!!

From: Stephanie Degner <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:04 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: Future PFD

Dear Legislatures,

As a single working mother of 3 small children, it would make such a huge difference in all of our lives to receive the PFD amount under Governor Dunleavy's plan. This would also be protecting the PFD for my children's future.

With the world in the current state of affairs, I think it would be unwise and appalling to issue a \$500 PFD to Alaskan's this year.

Please look out for the small people, like me and my family who work hard to get by on our own. I urge you to do the right thing, and support this plan.

Thank you for reading,

Stephanie Degner
Judicial Assistant

From: Amy <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:04 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: PFD testimony

I support a full PFD, with the PFD being put in the constitution and out of Legislature/government hands.

Amy Hall
[REDACTED]
North pole. 99705

From: Michael Urciuoli <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:05 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: Pfd

Obey the law. You know what is right. Life is short. Hell is not.

From: Nereida Quintero <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:05 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: Hello,im Nereida Quintero,i live in Anchorage ,Ak,,i like the permanent fund dividend is 2,350,my familias too like this,and,the permanend fund is it,State Constitución in Alaska,please do it,the 2,350 dollars,doblarse, for the pandemic,Alaska have bad...

I like the

From: Escrow Services & Foreclosures Bryant <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:06 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: Support Governor Dunleavy PFD plan

PLEASE support Governor Dunleavy's PFD Plan.

We are in full support of his plan. This will help so many Alaskans get through the coming winter after the terrible pandemic, when so many of us could not work.

Thank You for your support of Governor Dunleavy.

Yolanda and Rick Bryant

Wasilla, AK.

From: Deborah DeGrado <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:06 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: Testimony

I'm writing to respectfully request the legislature pass Governor Dunleavy's proposals for the increased PFD, including making it permanent for Alaskans.

This has been extraordinarily hard times for us all, and we as you know, have it even more difficult than the lower 48 does.

Please thoughtfully, wisely and compassionately consider this request.

Kind regards,

Debbie DeGrado
[REDACTED]

Fairbanks AK 99701

[REDACTED]

From: Paulette Conlin <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:08 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: Governor's plan for PFD

I would like to state my support for Governor Dunleavy's plan for the PFD. I urge to you support the \$2350 as well as putting his plan on the ballot for the voters to decide. I fully support our Governor and believe he has great ideas for our state.

The PFD is so important to so many families and villages who use that money for fuel and food. As well as families that put that money aside for their child's education. Please do the right thing.

Thank you,
Paulette Conlin
North Pole

From: Isabel Hall <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:08 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: PFD testimony

I support a full PFD.

From: Christopher Oeser <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:08 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: PFD

Hi,

Ive been in Alaska my entire life and have seen the PFD go up and down. I am very grateful for the money and I would appreciate if the legislators would make the right decision and put it is to law so it can't be used in other ways that it is not meant to be. Please put the plan the governor asked into action. Thank you.

-Christopher Oeser

From: Miranda McHenry <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:09 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: PFD Testimony

Dear Legislators,

Please give us Alaskans our full PFD's. We need it more than ever during this pandemic. Cutting it in half, or just giving a small portion is stealing.

From: Bryan Morris <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:10 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: PFD

To Whom It May Concern,

This should concern each and every one of you. The PFD is rightfully ours as Alaskan residents in lieu of mineral rights. At a time like this, you should not be attempting to withhold money previously set aside for hurting Alaskans. With rising inflation and job insecurity this money would be a much needed boost to all Alaskans.

Do what you know is right. Take your hands off what does not belong to the government.

Regards,
Bryan Morris

From: Robin Wilber <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:11 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: PFD

To whom it may concern,

I support Governor Dunleavy's plan for Alaska's PFD. I urge all of you to take a good look at this plan.

People are in need and this will stimulate the economy.

Thank you,
Robin Ozosky-Wilber

From: John Gorrell <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:12 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: Support Dunleavy

Please support The Governor's plan for the PFD of \$2350 !

Thank You
John Gorrell

Sitka Alaska

From: Cayla <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:12 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: HB 3003

This email is to express my support for a full PFD to all eligible Alaskans. The PFD amount should be determined based on the original financial distribution method set up per Governor Jay Hammond and others who established the Alaska permanent fund.
Dunlevy has my total support to provide a full PFD to every Alaskan that is eligible.

From: Mabel Danielson <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:12 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: Support governor PFD

Good afternoon,

Support Governor Dunleavy PDF

Thank you,
Mabel

From: Josh and Maria Cross <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:13 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: Please support Dunleavy's PFD Plan!!!!

Dear Legislators,

Please understand that the PFD helps most Alaskan's live and survive up here!!! I can imagine that might be hard to remember if you and your family are in a higher income level (this amount probably seems piddly), but for most Alaskan families the PFD is the difference between providing food, utilities, and supplies for their families! We have been very disappointed with the games and avoidance of doing your jobs instead of working hard and coming up with a solution/compromise that everyone can live with! Though I think the PFD shouldn't have been messed with in the first place back when Walker allowed the stealing of it, and we'd love to get the full amount we normally (traditionally) would be getting, I am thankful Dunleavy has put together a plan that is trying to meet everyone in the middle! Please support his plan so we can receive a good PFD that might actually help all of us Alaskans in a very tough economy and situation with the last year and a half of Covid, but also that we can have the PFD issue settled and protected so you all can get to work working on Alaska's future for all of us!!

Thank you!!

Maria Cross

From: Frank Entsminger <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:14 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: HB 3003 Testimony

How corrupt is the majority in our state government to highjack the PFD!!!! There is a formula for state government spending, you should all stick to it. The legislature should stop excessive government spending. Stick the the original intent of the PFD. Time to work for the people in Juneau. Government spending is out of control. Stop all the pork barrels by quick spending more money for frivolous projects that require more future funding for maintenance & etc.

We are ticked off that the Bush Caucus will not let our representative in. Talk about unwilling to work together. Looks like most legislators are not there for the people. Sad!! A native republican doesn't fit their narrative. Pretty bloody sad!! I'm not a republican or dumbarat but an extreme conservative.
Frank Entsminger, Wildlife Artist

Wilderness Creations

[REDACTED]

Tok AK 99780

www.wildernesscreations.com

[REDACTED]

From: Christina Brown <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:15 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: My public testimony for PFD

My Name is Christina Brown and Today, at 2:30pm the legislature is taking public testimony on the PFD. I support the governors plan, which calls for a \$2,350 PFD - the largest in state history. In and ecomonic hardship that all Alaskans are enduring deserve to be paid back all past dividends that are owed to all of us. It is a dividend from our residency inwhich needs to occurr interest paid back to us as well as the past due amounts. To guarantee the dividend in the Alaska constitution would only be right as Biden has already put a stall on our economy.

This is a dior time and needs to be addressed in a fair and equitable manner..

Regards,
Christina Brown

From: Barbara Yount <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:16 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: HB 3003

This email is to express my support for a full PFD to all eligible Alaskans. The PFD amount should be determined based on the original financial distribution method set up per Governor Jay Hammond and others who established the Alaska permanent fund. Dunlevy has my total support to provide a full PFD to every Alaskan that is eligible.

Barbara Yount
[REDACTED]

From: **vicmomma** <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:17 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: PFD testimony

I support Dunleavy's plan for a \$2350 PFD

From: Kelsey Saari <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:17 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: Alaska PFD

We stand with the governors plan. My family wants a legal solution to these ups and downs of the PFD every year. Enough.

Kelsey Saari

From: Joshua Bicchinella <joshua.bicchinella@chartercollege.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:17 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>; House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: HB3003 Testimony

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Joshua Bicchinella

Doctoral Candidate, Doctor of Public Administration
Campus President
Charter College
Direct: 907-352-1021
Cell: 253-802-2314



Joshua Bicchinella
Charter College, LLC.
Campus President
2221 E. Northern Lights Blvd
Anchorage, AK 99508
Direct: (907) 352-1021

August 24, 2021
House Finance Committee
Co-chair Foster & Co-chair Johnston

RE: HB3003 Support

Dear House Finance Committee,

First, I'd like to acknowledge and show my appreciation to the committee for reviewing my testimony. Charter College has operated in Alaska for the past 36 years. Many of our students, much like the University system, rely on APS and AEG funding to pursue postsecondary education. Many of which are low-income, underserved populations, and first-generation students.

Below are a few statistics from the recent [Alaska Higher Education Almanac 2021](#) edition, issued by the Alaska Commission for Postsecondary Education, that I felt were crucial in considering as we weigh the implications of HB3003 and continued financial delays to our affected, eligible student populations.

Alaska Education Grant:

- 100% of the 2,189 AEG recipients awarded in 2020 were low-income students.
 - 42% were first-generation students.
 - 7% were Alaska Native or American Indian
- A 2017 survey indicates that 61% of former recipients said the Alaska Education Grant played a role in their ability to graduate.
- Of 2019 AEG recipients, 12.8% of awards went to Alaska Native/American Indian students at UA relative to the student body overall.

Alaska Performance Scholarship:

- Shifting to the APS, according to a 2020 survey of eligible 2019 graduates, 81% indicated the Alaska Performing Scholarship made students more likely to choose an in-state school.
 - 73% stated they were more likely to take placement exams
 - 92% stated they would recommend to current high school students

- Of those APS eligible students enrolling in college for the fall of 2019
 - 77% of APS eligible students enrolled vs. 29% of ineligible students.

WWAMI:

- Finally, the WWAMI program provides access and pathways to Native Alaskan, American Indian, and other demographics to find future professions in medicine, and we must make funding these pathways a priority.

We are all aware of the challenges the state faces with students pursuing academic pathways and opportunities out of Alaska; we need to prioritize and partner together to keep our children and adult learners here in Alaska.

On behalf of Charter College, I'd like to thank the committee for my time today, and I strongly encourage we seek resolution to fund the APS, AEG, and WWAMI Programs with all appropriate haste.

Thank you,

Joshua Bicchinella
Campus President

From: Michael Hetherington <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:19 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: Pfd

I support Dunleavy's plan for the PFD

From: Jessie Bryant <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:20 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: Highly Support Gov. Dunleavy's PFD Plan

Hello,

I highly support Gov. Dunleavy's PFD Plan,
and so would all of you!

If you listen to the people you represent, you should know that we are all in support of getting our proper PFD amount!

Thank you,
Jessie Bryant

From: Kylie Briles <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:20 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: Support Dunleavy's putting pfd into constitution

To whom it may concern,

I ask but at this point beg to put the pfd into the constitution under Dunleavy's constitutional amendment and giving out a rightfully deserved \$2,350 pfd. At this point you are stealing money from the people who deserve it most! It belongs to the people and especially this year after people have lost jobs, businesses, high heat cost, high gas costs but because it is supposed to go to the people who are begging you to give it to them. Do the right thing and give the people the pfd at \$2,350 and permanently put it into the Alaska constitution where it belongs.

Thanks

From: kathleen shoop <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:20 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: phone was not working

Dear House Finance;

I was on hold for a long time, when my name was called, I muted and put phone to ear and there was someone else talking. I closed window and still heard the other person. I had to hang up and call back. I am currently on hold. Not sure the system is working as I am sitting here listening.

I support the Governor's plan for the PFD. I support a full PFD! If the Gov's plan is the best we can do.

People in Alaska and the economy need their money.

Kathleen Shoop

From: grinnyma [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:21 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: PDF

Good Afternoon,

I would like to voice my opinion on Governor Dunlevy's PFD Plan. I stand behind him 100%. Our legislator's need to get a grip on reality and stand behind the people, not the special interest. Our state is in a slump no thanks to you and a larger dividend would certainly help the people of Alaska. Even though you feel that we think we are intitled, this is not true. It is you who think you are intitled to our money. We as citizens gave up a lot to receive this money and now for the past 5 years, you have taken it away from us. You feel you can do a better job. That is a laugh. We as citizens of Alaska, do demand our rights to our dividend. We stand behind the Governor 100%.

Thank you,
Della Divelbiss

From: Sarah Tudor <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:22 PM

To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>

Subject: PFD

Please approve the full PFD for Alaskan's. Our family has lost around \$65,000 since this change which would have helped our family with helping more local businesses from buying local, going to fun centers, hotels, etc. Along with our children's college funds for UAA. Since this change we don't add near what we use to for our kids college funds.

Praying for our government leaders and for the right decision to be made.

Sarah Tudor
Palmer, AK

From: Amy Flynn <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:23 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: Support our full PFD

Good Afternoon,

I would like to show my support of Governor Dunleavy's PFD Plan for Alaskans.

As Alaskans, we have faced an unusually hard year in 2020 and well as 2021. Losing our rightful PFD amount will bring only greater financial strain for the middle and low-income families across our great state.

As a single parent myself, the PFD provides much need financial balance.

Most families use the PFD to purchase winter tires, fill their home fuel tanks, buy winter gear for their children, and pay for child care expenses. Losing any amount of PFD is a direct hit to the heart of Alaska families.

Please consider the effect you are having on every single Alaskan family when are choosing to take our PFD to pay for a bigger government, that ultimately has no benefit to Alaskans.

Amy Flynn

From: Missi Zortman <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:23 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: Governor Dunleavy's PFD PLAN

My name is Joyce M. Zortman and I am sending this email in support of Governor Dunleavy's PFD plan including a \$2,350 dividend.

From: Katie Ruedy <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:24 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: PFD

My Name is Katie Ruedy and Today, at 2:30pm the legislature is taking public testimony on the PFD. I support the governors plan, which calls for a \$2,350 PFD - the largest in state history. In economic hardship that all Alaskans are enduring deserve to be paid back all past dividends that are owed to all of us. It is a dividend from our residency in which needs to occur in Interest paid back to us as well as the past due amounts. To guarantee the dividend in the Alaska constitution would only be right as Biden has already put a stall on our economy. This is a crucial time and needs to be addressed in a fair and equitable manner.. I have put this testimony online as I could not get through over the phone lines. Thank you.

-Katie Ruedy

From: michael johnson <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:24 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: Pfd

We are a household of 5 and we have 70 family members in the mat Su valley we are greatly disappointed in our alaska legislature with the resistance to paying out full PDFs to every Alaskan I am a fourth generation Alaskan and watching my taxes go up and my pfd go down even though the pfd is at an all time high this just isn't adding up or making sense with the testimonials by the people against full PDFs I know that the Alaskan peoples votes the last election period should have voiced how they felt about the politicians against the full PDFs with most of them losing their seats I hope that you open up your eyes and ears and start listening to the Alaskan people and seeing the effects that the pfd does with most families helping us pay for fuel costs for the winter fill our freezers and help buy winter clothing for our children I hope you listen to my point of view and at least mull this over from your seat and realize that this is not only wrong but it's theft thank you for your time michael johnson

Sent from my iPhone

From: Marc Riedlinger <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:25 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: Full PFD

Stop taking my PFD.

Marc A Riedlinger
[REDACTED]
Wasilla AK 99654

From: suzette becker <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:25 PM

To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: Governor Dunleavy's plan

I'm writing in support for Governor Dunleavy's dividend plan which includes the \$2350.00 dividend.

Thank you,
Suzette Becker

From: Jeremy Kylie Briles <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:25 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: Support Dunleavy \$2,350 pfd and pfd into the constitution

Hello,

I am writing asking for the state legislators to listen to the people of Alaska who majority are asking the legislators to do right by the people of Alaska and give us the rightfully deserved \$2,350 pfd and put it into the constitution 50/50. You all are not listening to the people of Alaska who are asking you to do this and are going by your own personal opinions which is not how it should be. This year of all people truly need the help and your services don't help everyone like you fail to realize. This money is rightfully Alaskans and you are stealing from us which is so wrong. If you think we don't deserve the pfd half the size it's supposed to be then how about all the legislators cut their salaries in half and tell us how it feels. Do the right thing and vote for the people of Alaska by giving them a \$2,350 pfd like it should be.

From: Pollyanna Jenks <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:25 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: HB3003

To whom it concerns:

I am writing in full support of Governor Dunleavy's PFD plan. We have all been through a terrible time in our country/state. Many, many people need this money in their pockets to be able to support their families after losing so much. I have been here more than 45 years, so I was a resident when the PFD program first started. There were times when many of us lived for getting some financial relief for our families at PFD time and then again during tax refunds. The money was meant to be shared directly with the People of this state and not be taken over by politicians and legislators. It should not be spent on any politician's pet project. Projects that the majority of us have no say in. The PFD needs to be protected and remain a dividend paid out to the people of this state.

Thank You,
Pollyanna Jenks
Wasilla, Zak

From: Josh and Maria <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:25 PM

To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: Please vote yes on Dunleavy's PFD Plan!!!

Good Afternoon Legislators,

Over the last eight years, I've been disappointed in the Legislator's inability to represent the Alaskan's interest in the PFD. Alaskan Families are more capable of using that money to meet their needs than you give us credit for! We recognize that the PFD is not a consistent amount, but your actions don't allow us the ability to manage those funds to our benefit. Please support Dunleavy's PFD plan to resolve the PFD issue, so you can move on to doing real business for the future of Alaska!

Expecting more from you,

Josh Cross

From: Bill Price <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:26 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: I support a constitutional 50/50 PFD

Please constitutionalize the 50/50 PFD as well as the PCE fund.

Bill [REDACTED]

From: Rosella Middleton <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:29 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: PFD

Dear Finance House,
I would like you to support our governors recommendation for the Permanent Fund.
After a year like this one our homes and small businesses need this support to help their families and businesses recover.
Thank you,
Rosella Middleton

From: Cindy <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:29 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: PFD testimony

Do not accept Gov Dunleavy's version of the PFD payout. It is too high and will bankrupt Alaska.

Cindy Farrens

[REDACTED]
Wasilla, AK 99654

From: Alice Liedke <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:29 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: Proposed Dunleavy PFD plan

Dear Lawmakers,

I am urging you all to support Gov. Dunleavy's PFD plan which includes a \$2350 dividend. People are hurting everywhere and our lawmakers need to start thinking about the people and what is best for them and not their own interests. Alaskan's all have to manage our personal lives - can't spend more than we make, and do without when necessary and we expect our politicians to do the same. You are civil servants. You are in the position that you are in to serve the people who voted you into office. Alaskan's are being abused by lawmakers and it is time for brave lawmakers to take a stand and do what is right. Alaskan's will no longer forgive and forget and just take the crumbs that are thrown to them.

Hope you are listening to us.

Thank you.

Alice Liedke

Alaskan resident and business owner
[REDACTED]

From: nelsen [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:31 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Cc: nelsen@gci.net
Subject: I support Gov. Dunleavy 8/24/21 - Please confirm receipt

Dear All,

I fully support Dunleavy plan .
I support your act, the full dividends payout,
Place PFD in Constitution, and the road system.

Thank you,

Mary Nelsen
Seward, Ak

From: Miranda Hocker <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:32 PM

To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: Alaskans PFD

The fact that it has to be decided by people who apparently never learned how to budget for themselves is not okay. Alaskans gave up their mineral rights in exchange for the PFD so the state "legislators" are literally stealing our money and they don't even care that they are. I'm a life long Alaskan and this has gotten out of control.

Give the people their money back. It is our right as an Alaskan not yours as a legislator to decide for us. That's why it was in there that if anything where to change it had to be VOTED upon by the ALASKAN PEOPLE if they wanted to make any changes to it.

I am tired of our stupid legislators thinking they know what is best for us instead of listening to the people. You are paid to do what we want not what you think is best.

LEARN HOW TO BUDGET!!!! GIVE US OUR MONEY BACK THAT YOU HAVE UNLAWFULLY STOLEN!!!

This frustrated Alaskan
Miranda Hocker

From: pastorino [REDACTED] >
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:32 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: HB 3003

While we appreciate all the work that has gone into creating HB 3003, we do not think it is a wise choice, as it will clearly overdraw the permanent fund, and we need a more sustainable choice. Most of us don't need a \$2,350 per person dividend. Some, however, may. We support a more combined effort that directly creates a sustainable, fair fund that supports individuals in need and services. We support funding the WAMI medical program but think that needs to be a separate bill and not wrapped into a bill addressing the permanent fund. Thank you for your service to our State. Ray and Barbara Pastorino

From: Smith <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:34 PM
To: Sen. David Wilson <Sen.David.Wilson@akleg.gov>; House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>; Rep. Christopher Kurka <Rep.Christopher.Kurka@akleg.gov>
Subject: PFD

As a voting constituent in 7-D, I urge you to support Governor Dunleavy's plan that provides for a \$2,350 PFD.

From: Jeff Urbanus <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:37 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>; Rep. Cathy Tilton <Rep.Cathy.Tilton@akleg.gov>

Cc: Sen. Shelley Hughes <sen.shelley.hughes@akleg.gov>

Subject: Please do not support the Governors PFD plan.

Hello,

I'm am writing to you to express my hope that you do not support Governor Dunleavy's current PFD plan. This in an ill-conceived endeavor that will worsen the state's already troubled budget situation and ultimately threaten the Permanent Fund itself. The creators of the Permanent Fund and Permanent Fund Dividend had the option to place them in the Alaska Constitution and choose not to. Given how obvious the negative economics of this proposal and the history of false promises by the Governor, I am left with no other conclusion that his current proposal is a cynical attempt to ingratiate himself with ill-informed voters as an election approaches. I ask that you show a level of responsibility and seriousness that the Governor cannot seem to muster and vote against this proposal.

Sincerely,

Jeff Urbanus

Peters Creek, Alaska

From: Cayla <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:38 PM

To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>

Subject: HB 3003

The PFD is how Alaskan families survive ...

We already have high rates of rent, food is expensive, not to mention gas prices.

I use this to buy kids school clothes, winter gear, I pay months worth of electric/gas, sometimes I pay months of rent in advance. This helps me and my kids get through the winter with out super struggling. I'm a single mom of three, I raise my kids on my own with one income, it gets extremely difficult. The pfd really helps me out to stay afloat. I don't understand how the people in office steal this from us. It's disgusting how selfish Alaska has become. Where's the marijuana tax going? Why do you need to to steal from the people for your poor spending habits? This was not meant for you to dip your dirty hands into! This is criminal! And it sad and disgusting knowing that you guys break the law and nothing happens... how dare you have the audacity to be crooked and selfish. Greed lives in your guyses heart. I hope you're are never in a spot that you need financial help in. How dare you bite the hand that feeds you and your family, we employed you.

From: Tammy Fuller <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:38 PM

To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>

Subject: Support Gov Dunleavy PFD

Good afternoon. I am in support of the Governor's \$2350 Permanent Fund Dividend amount and urge the legislatures to follow suit.

Alaskans are in NEED and it's disturbing how little the government who represents our voice cares.

Please do what is right! Please do what we elected you to do!!

Sincerely
Tammy Fuller

This email is intended for all legislatures of Alaska!! housefinance@akleg.gov

Tammy Fuller
REALTOR®
RE/MAX Dynamic of the Valley

From: D RILEY CHADWELL <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:39 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: PFD THEFT

Attention AK LEGISLATURE:

Your phone lines are busy & I cannot get through.

Pay back what you STOLE from your constituency. Including interest. Stop violating the protections put in place when Gov. Hammond created our PFD system.

You have no right to prey on the finances of disabled residents in the lowest tax bracket who've sacrificed our bodies for YOU. You've taken unfair advantage of me personally. I refuse to tolerate well off HEALTHY people stealing from their constituents.

You've forced ME to live in a hell hole without running water, then you steal the only financial shot in the arm I rely on annually. What's the thinking behind taking such abusive actions toward me? If you hate me that much, at least make my death an easy one vs slowly starving me to death and cutting my finances to the point I can't afford to pay \$1250/mo in RENT for a home with everything YOU TAKE FOR GRANTED. Either RAISE SOCIAL SECURITY DISABILITY TO \$2000.00 per month so Alaskans can AFFORD to STAY in Alaska paying TAXES so the legislature HAS AN INCOME.

Stop destroying my life. Time to shit or get off the pot people, Dr. Chadwell

[REDACTED]
Delta Junction AK 99737

PS: every time you fly anywhere, you're riding on MY work. The very work that rendered me paralyzed in both hands and arms at age 36. Without ME, the world wouldn't have a hush kit on any of its aircraft & ALASKA wouldn't have a lot of places we built in the 70-90's as a DOT wife. DOT wives deserve a portion of their HUSBANDS retirement whether our marriages SURVIVE WHAT YOU EXPECT OF US OR NOT!!! Without us staying at home in a remote Highway camp trailer somewhere, YOU have NO ONE to plow your highways. Men cannot nurse children, or

make sure there's clean clothing and packed lunches when they're operating heavy equipment.
YOU OWE ME

From: Dianna Hyatt <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:39 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: PFD

Good afternoon,

I want to speak regarding the PFD. I am a lifelong Alaskan. I have been receiving a dividend since the first dividend payout started. My children have all received permanent fund dividends and my grandchildren are now receiving permanent fund money. I am a single parent with four children remaining at home. I work every day and my children go to school every day. Over the last few years that we've received a very small dividend it has seriously affected our household

[https://urldefense.com/v3/http://budget.As;!!LdQKC6s!cxWA_pIua2vKd7GaszezoWrsJIeUs-D0pKo4vthc_ce0d5DuyCSp1B0rMEwKreMDBIX\\$](https://urldefense.com/v3/http://budget.As;!!LdQKC6s!cxWA_pIua2vKd7GaszezoWrsJIeUs-D0pKo4vthc_ce0d5DuyCSp1B0rMEwKreMDBIX$) a single parent our permanent fund money is not spent on frivolous things, it is spent on necessary items such as winter clothing, winter boots, winter coats and food. It allows my children to participate in sport activities, and the travel that's needed for the sport activities. Since you have been taking half of our permanent fund, my growing children have had to use their winter coats two years in a row and hand it down to the next child if there's anything left of it. They've not been able to do traveling for sports and it's forced us to use reduced lunch or free lunch. This last year was particularly hard because of Covid. My children had to homeschool because they were unable to do the online schooling. I've had to takeoff work and reduce my 35 hours a week down to 10 hours a week. It would've been very nice to have a full PFD last year. This year particularly has caused me to run up my credit cards and work with utility companies to keep my heat and lights on. A full PFD would be able to pay those off and purchase the items my children need to live every day lives. We have not been able to go buy school clothes this year. We have just had to make due with what we have. Reducing the dividend to a minimal amount of money may not mean much to people who have money and don't need their PFTs. However, in our family it's part of our budget which we have expected over the last 40 years. Dividends should remain untouched by politicians. Taking the PFD over the last few years has done nothing for my family except cause me to have more hardship and my children to miss out on normal things in life.

Dianna Hyatt
Kenai Alaska

From: rovahn@[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:39 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: Pfd , cost of living

Due to the loss of two family members this summer I traveled to Oregon and Florida in July and August .

When I arrived back to Wasilla I went shopping for my home and a 11 oz box of Cheerios now costs \$6.49 .

This is NOT the cost of same flavor and ounces in either of those states and my local grocery has never changed that amount in the past .
I was so shocked I had to take a picture.
These prices hurt families.
The federal government keeps telling us we will "get back to normal" but the food and fuel budget is not looking like that at all.
Times are difficult and to add insult to injury to be told we get \$525 when the legislature gets thousands in per diem is a slap in the face .
We don't make as much as you.
I Support the governors plan for the amount and to conserve for the future of the PFD.

-Angela Weber
Wasilla Ak

From: Laura Young <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:40 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: public testimony

I want to state my approval for the Governor's plan for the PFD.
Laura Lemons
[REDACTED]

From: Kevin Ruedy <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:41 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: PFD

My Name is Kevin Ruedy and Today, at 2:30pm the legislature is taking public testimony on the PFD. I support the governors plan, which calls for a \$2,350 PFD - the largest in state history. In economic hardship that all Alaskans are enduring deserve to be paid back all past dividends that are owed to all of us. It is a dividend from our residency in which needs to occur in Interest paid back to us as well as the past due amounts. To guarantee the dividend in the Alaska constitution would only be right as Biden has already put a stall on our economy. This is a crucial time and needs to be addressed in a fair and equitable manner.. I have put this testimony online as I could not get through over the phone lines. Thank you.

V/r

Kevin Ruedy

From: Kaitlyn Norris <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:41 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: Support Dunleavy PFD plan

My name is Kaitlyn Norris. I have been a resident of Alaska for over 15 years. My 5 children were born in the Great State of Alaska. We are in support of Governor Dunleavy' pfd plan. These 2 years have been extremely difficult for many Alaskans residents. Dunleavy's proposal would greatly help residents recover from financial hardships due to the pandemic.

Please vote for Dunleavy pfd plan.

Thank You,
Kaitlyn Norris

From: Andrew Malavansky <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:41 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: PFD

My name is Andrew Malavansky and I live in the valley and am a registered voter, I support the full PFD amount for Alaska residents.

From: Dee <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:41 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: PFD

Please support Governor Dunleavy's plan of \$2,350 for PFD amount.

Thank you.

Dee Prescott

Wasilla, Alaska

Sent from my iPhone

From: Larisa B <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:42 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: Governor Dunleavy's PFD plan proposal

Good day,

I'm writing to urge you all to please support our governor Mike Dunleavy's PFD plan to pay out Alaskan residents \$2,350 for the year 2020.

For many of us that year was a challenging year, including individuals, families, old and young, small businesses, and communities in whole. People had to either make accommodations to work from home or leave jobs and adjust to be able to supervise school/college children while online learning. Good amount of residents lost their jobs/ businesses while our Alaskan businesses were closed due to quarantine and /or decrease in tourism.

We kindly ask you to please hear us out and not intimidate this proposal. It will help the Alaskans to live through the winter, pay the bills and put food on our tables and support our families, especially with the inflation that has already started.

Thank you for your time and consideration!

Sincerely,

Larisa Cherepanov

From: Veronica Poland <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:42 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: I Support Dunleavy's \$2,350 PFD plan!

Hello!

I am a life-long Alaskan resident and I fully support Gov. Dunleavy's plan for the PFD.

Thank you!
Veronica Poland

From: Cindy Glassmaker <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:43 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: HB3003 - Support

Good Afternoon. I respectfully ask that you support the Governor's PFD plan, which includes a \$2350 dividend under HB3003. This would be a tremendous help to my family and to so many Alaskan families.

Thank you,
Cynthia Glassmaker

From: Melissa Berggren <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:46 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: 2021 PFD

To Whom it May Concern:

I would like to express my disgust at the fact we are in the position we are with squabbling over the Permanent Fund. Since Walker's meddling, year after year Alaskans have been screwed over and government spending has been inflated. I vote in favor of Dunleavy's compromise because it is sadly our best hope for any kind of fairness from here going forward. As legislators your job is to represent the people and I haven't met a single person in favor of the insulting \$525 that has been suggested. Please do your job and vote in accordance with what the majority of Alaskans are in favor of.

Best Regards,
Melissa Berggren

Sent from my iPhone

From: Staci <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:46 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: SUPPORT GOV. DUNLEAVY'S PFD PLAN

We, the people you represent, implore you to support Governor's Dunleavy's PFD Plan to include a \$2,350.00 Dividend this year.

Being a single mom of five I could really use this to help pay bills and the super high cost of gas, etc. The State of Alaska should support it's people in this difficult pandemic time. We can not say it loud enough.....WE IMPLORE YOU TO PAY OUT THE \$2,350.00 PFD AND GIVE THE PEOPLE THE RIGHT TO VOTE ON CHANGING THE CONSTITUTIONAL PFD. WE DO NOT WANT TO PAY A PFD TAX.

Sincerely,

Staci Yates

[REDACTED]
Wasilla, AK 99687
[REDACTED]

From: Amy Breazeale <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:46 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: We support Governor Dunleavy

Pdf proposal. Please back this as well.

Amy Breazeale
[REDACTED]

From: Faith Glassmaker <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:48 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: HB3003 Support

Hello,

I am an Alaska resident, currently attending college and a full PFD will help go towards my college tuition, books, and other supplies. I ask that that you please support HB3003 and with that a full PFD.

Thank you,
Faith Glassmaker

From: Cindy Caserta <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:38 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: House Finance public hearing

To our House Legislature,

I am an active voter and homeowner in the MatSu Valley. Today as you hold a public hearing on our PFDs and other important issues facing the people of Alaska, I cannot get through on the phone lines to speak publicly. I strongly urge you to vote with full approval for Gov. Mike Dunleavy's PFD plan & budget ideas which seeks to address and correct some of the wrong decisions by former legislators, including too much spending & stealing from the PFD, which was designed with clear restrictions. Dunleavy's multi-year plan is put together with clear decisions to help Alaskan residents. This topic is very important to us and PFD promises helped elect Mike Dunleavy and you. I am one person of many who will follow and vote on whether or not our representatives truly want to fulfill and correct our PFDs, while cutting spending & repaying the PFD fund. Please approve our Governor's responsible plan to restore the PFD and correct the prior mistakes of the past, while voting for responsible state budget.

Respectfully,

Cindy Caserta
MatSu resident & voter
[REDACTED]

From: Jen Craft <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:50 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: Dunleavy proposal

Dear Lawmakers,

I am urging you all to support Gov. Dunleavy's PFD plan which includes a \$2350 dividend. People are hurting everywhere and our lawmakers need to start thinking about the people and what is best for them and not their own interests. Alaskan's all have to manage our personal lives - can't spend more than we make, and do without when necessary and we expect our politicians to do the same. You are civil servants. You are in the position that you are in to serve the people who voted you into office. Alaskan's are being abused by lawmakers and it is time for brave lawmakers to take a stand and do what is right. Alaskan's will no longer forgive and forget and just take the crumbs that are thrown to them.

Hope you are listening to us.

Thank you.

Jen
Alaskan resident and registered nurse

From: Geri McLeod <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:53 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: Permanent fund vote today

Dear house finance committee,
I am an Alaska resident who has lived in Juneau for the past 37 years. I have seen the years when the budget was well funded by oil revenues because oil prices were high and we were able to realistically give out big dividends and not need an income tax to fund sustainable infrastructure and projects. That is not the case right now. These are lean times and oil prices are low and we can't realistically pay out a large dividend without Alaska's future being fiscally compromised. With the transition to alternative green energy, the world's demand for oil including Alaska's oil is diminishing. Our financial stability can't be based on a wish and a prayer that the oil prices will increase again and so start spending what we have in the Permanent Fund based on the unrealistic hope. I have daughter and son in law with two children who hope and dream for a promising future in Alaska where jobs are secure, schools are well funded and raising a family here is based on a healthy economy.
I ask that you decide not to approve the 50|50 draw as proposed by the governor.
Keep Alaska's future secure.

Thanks for listening.
Geri McLeod

[REDACTED]
Juneau, Alaska 99801
[REDACTED]

From: Philip Somervell <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:55 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: PFD legislation

I am writing to strongly oppose this proposed legislation. Many of us Alaskans do not need the money, and it would be better spent if targeted to those who need it, e. g., through improved benefits and services. Again, please do NOT pass this.

Thank you,
Philip Somervell

[REDACTED]
Palmer, AK 90645
[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

From: Andrew Fawcett <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:55 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: Full pfd

I would like a full PFD in fact I'd like back pay for all my PFDs that where not full since you all were never supposed to touch our money in the first place

From: della divelbiss <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:55 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: PFD

I stand behind Gov Dunleavy on his \$2350.00 Dividend. There is nothing worse in this world worse than a liar & Cheat, but that is exactly what 2/3's of our legislative body is at this time.

From: Deb Berggren <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:56 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: PFD

PFD

To Whom it May Concern:

I would like to express my disgust at the fact we are in the position we are with squabbling over the Permanent Fund. Since Walker's meddling, year after year Alaskans have been screwed over and government spending has been inflated. I vote in favor of Dunleavy's compromise because it is sadly our best hope for any kind of fairness from here going forward. As legislators your job is to represent the people and I haven't met a single person in favor of the insulting \$525 that has been suggested. Please do your job and vote in accordance with what the majority of Alaskans are in favor of.
Best Regards,

Rance & Deborah Berggren

[REDACTED]
Fbks AK 99712

From: Pamela Bickford <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:57 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>; Sen. Roger Holland <Senator.Roger.Holland@akleg.gov>; Rep. James Kaufman <Rep.James.Kaufman@akleg.gov>
Subject: Appropriations Testimony for 8/24/2021

I have repeatedly advocated for repealing past legislation that encumbered the lawful statutory calculation of the dividend that worked well for 30 plus years and would operate far into the future. I am pissed that I am given this opportunity to beg for a pittance of this appropriations bill instead of the legislature returning to the still legal, determination of "our" dividend appropriation by the statutory calculation.

The legislature is, in part entrusted, and held accountable, to the people of the State of Alaska. At what point does "politically accountable" transfer to criminally accountable?

As an elected official, entrusted with representative power, are any of you considering your oath of office as you participate in this, and prior proceedings?

I will not beg, nor will I encourage support of any worthy expenditure, as our elected officials have created chaos that, even if there was cooperation by all involved, the entanglement would need further "special sessions" to sort. This legislature has wasted time and resources far beyond my understanding and support!

You may ignore your "oath of office" but you may not ignore the constitutional protections, read "rights", of your constituents! Do not rely on your legal loophole. Do what is rightfully afforded by law! Reread your oath of office and read the foundation documents if you need further clarification.

Sent from my iPad

From: GCI <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:57 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Cc: Me <rockinga@gci.net>
Subject: Public comment HB 3003

My name is Amy Anderson Voter ID: 1102068

House/Precinct: 29-110

I live permanently and full time in Cooper Landing, Alaska.

I'm emailing you to show my support of HB 3003.

I support Governor Dunleavy's PFD plan 100%.

It's been a rough couple years for many Alaskan Families and passage of HB 3003 would certainly be helpful this year and in future years.

PLEASE pass this bill!

Sincerely,

Amy Anderson
[REDACTED]

From: Candace Weidler <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:59 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: PFD

My name is Candace Harman-Weidler, and today at 2:30 pm the legislature is taking public testimony on the PFD. I support the Governor's plan, which calls for a \$2,350 PFD - the largest in state history. In this economic hardship, which all Alaskans are enduring, Alaskans need to be paid back all past dividends. We need to guarantee the dividend in the Alaska constitution. This is critical for the PFD to continue as originally envisioned. Alaskans are counting on you! Thank you!

From: Keyshawn Fawcett <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:00 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: I support a full pfd

From: Kirk Marvin <wk[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:01 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: Legislative action

Sirs:

My wife and I sincerely hope you can finally stop the nonsense and come to an agreement on the PFD issue now. We feel the Governor has put an honest and reasonable offer on the table to end this partisan game that will be beneficial for all Alaskans for the future. The current legislative body should be ashamed of the manner in which you have handled yourselves. We expect this from Democrats but the sheer number of self serving so called Republicans that have come forth to expose their true colors is appalling. We expect better.

Please pass the PFD bill as proposed by our elected Governor and get on with the job you were appointed to do.

Respectfully as best I can muster, Kirk and Diana Marvin

From: meghan dean <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 3:59 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: Pfd

Alaskans pfd should not be touched. We need the funds that were meant for us! Most everyone I know will be using the money for essentials this year. Not only that, but it will be going back into our economy. How is this a bad thing! Let us at least have the proposal that Gov. Dunleavy is planning.

Meghan Foord

Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:03 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: Testimony on the PFD

Hello,

I'm writing to tell you all that I fully support Governor Dunleavy's plan for the PFD, and to permanently guarantee it for the people of Alaska by putting it in our state's constitution. The PFD is OUR money and it never should've been used by the state government in the first place. Stop stealing from the citizens of Alaska!

Thank you,

Brittany Stushek
[REDACTED]

From: C Moll <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:04 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: Public testimony

Although I am for a 50/50 split POMV formula, I want it to be part of a long term solution, that involves a constitutional PFD protected from the whims of legislators and governors. I ask all of u to work toward a permanent fiscal plan, one that includes alternative revenues, meaning revenues outside of taxing the PFD, and I want to see a constitutional PFD at the end of this process. Unfortunately the process seems broken, and it seems we have a handful of powerful legislators holding the process hostage until the people's PFD is entirely diverted to pay for govt. Please fight to overcome these legislators, in an effort to protect this program for future generations, and to come up with a responsible fiscal plan that can stand the test of time. Please!

I support this appropriation, even tho it is not a long term solution.

Catherine Felt
Kenai

From: Alicia Spencer <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:05 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: Support Governor Dunleavy

Please support Governor Dunleavy and pay out a PFD!

Respectfully,

Alicia Spencer

From: Colleen Van Vleet <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:05 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: PFD Support Gov Dunleavy

My name is Colleen Van Vleet. I am representing myself and my family for support of the full PFD. I have lived in Anchorage since 1965 and considered to be one of the little people.

The PFD has benefited the State by the People spending the dollars back into the general population. This brings up our economy and makes us all better off.

I believe the PFD needs to be paid in full and the PFD put into the State Constitution.

Thank you.
Colleen Van Vleet
Anchorage AK 99515

[REDACTED]

From: C Moll <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:06 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: HB 3003 public testimony

I support this bill but I want a Constitutional PFD protected for the long term.

Kyle Felt
Kenai

From: Jessica West <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:07 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: PFD Support

My husband and I would like to add our opinion on the PFD and support Governor Dunleavy's most recent plan for the \$2350. We as Alaskan's expect this to help support our living here. Please support the people. Thank you.

-Jessica and Michael West

From: Mitch Berggren <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:08 PM

To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: PFD

To Whom it May Concern:

I would like to express my disgust at the fact we are in the position we are with squabbling over the Permanent Fund. Since Walker's meddling, year after year Alaskans have been screwed over and government spending has been inflated. I vote in favor of Dunleavy's compromise because it is sadly our best hope for any kind of fairness from here going forward. As legislators your job is to represent the people and I haven't met a single person in favor of the insulting \$525 that has been suggested. Please do your job and vote in accordance with what the majority of Alaskans are in favor of. As for my family, our PFD is given back to the state to pay for our ridiculously high property taxes anyway.

Mitch Berggren

From: Kari Nations <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:12 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: I support Dunleavy and my PFD

I would like to make a public testimony. I fully support Dunleavys plan. Place the PFD in the states constitution!

There should have never been a change without a public vote!! The fund belongs to the people of Alaska collectively. It was to be used and conserved for the maximum benefit of the people. And the followings generations to come. The fund should be a constitutional right, not a gift bestowed by a generous government.

No cap. I 100% believe the legislation needs to do what's right and approve Dunleavys plan immediately for the people who are struggling right now.

Kari L. Nations
[REDACTED]
Fairbanks, AK 99707

From: Judith Ritenburgh <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:13 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: PFD

The PFD account and its \$81,000,000,000 belong exclusively to the citizens of this state! Our investments have been well managed by the private companies the citizens have hired! There is

not one penny of state money in our account! It is ours, the law is still on the books, return our PFD to its well managed and self sustaining place, pay back every penny you have stolen and then protect it from ever being stolen again by any elected officials of this state!
You have already taken \$80,000 from my family! Taxes? Income taxes? Government fees? I am not sure! My irs forms put PFD under income where We pay federal taxes on it!

Stealing private citizens private investment money is not moral, plus regardless of what Walker did, it is illegal!
Sent from my iPad

From: Calvin Samuelu <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:13 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: PFD

Hello I am Calvin Samuelu. I am writing in supporting Gov. Dunleavy's \$2350. We are all in this very hard times. We really really need this help. This PFD if approved it will help out a lot. So please we support the Governor's proposal.

Thank you,
Calvin Samuelu

From: Heather Smith <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:13 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: 2021 PFD

To Whom It May Concern; I would like to express my disgust at the fact we are in a position we are with squabbling over the PFD. Since Walker's meddling, year after year Alaskans have been screwed over and government spending has been inflated. I voted in favor of Dunleavy's compromise because it is sadly our best hope for any kind of fairness from here going forward. As legislators your job is to represent the people and I haven't met anyone in favor of the unreasonable low amount of \$525 that has been suggested. Please do your job and vote in accordance with what the majority of Alaskans are in favor of.

Best Regards,

Heather Smith
[REDACTED]
North Pole, AK 99705

From: Judith Ritenburgh <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:15 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: Historical Timeline

Where does it say steal money!

<https://pfd.alaska.gov/Division-Info/Historical-Timeline>

From: Jerrod Dunbar <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:16 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: PFD

All,

I am in favor of a full pfd payout and back pay for the years the statutory formula was not followed.

It's pretty simple to me. I believe there is something fundamentally wrong with lawmakers who do not follow the law themselves.

We have more than enough funding and this issue has been an unwelcome hurdle in our legislative process for far too long.

I alone reached almost 1000 people in the most recent campaign I volunteered for. And that is only what was tracked in the application we used (not including the people I spoke to at stores, restaurants, my neighborhood, online, social media etc).

The upcoming decision on the pfd will largely determined how I vote and what campaigns I volunteer for in the next elections.

Respectfully,

Jerrod Dunbar
[REDACTED]
Anchorage Resident - District 26-M

From: Roy Hansen <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:16 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: PFD

Quit stealing our PFD we demand a full PFD of \$2,350 this year, and then pay us back all the money you stole from us the last few years, we are tired of you stealing or money owned to every Alaskan.

Roy L.Hansen Jr.

Sent from my iPad

From: Sterling Mazon <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:17 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: PFD

I, Sterling Mazon support a full PFD.

From: Jan Conitz <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:18 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: HB 3003

House Finance Committee Members,

I have been trying to call in to testify this afternoon, and the lines have been jammed with callers. Having listened to some of the testimony, I am very appalled and depressed at the short-term thinking and lack of any vision whatsoever of Alaska's future represented by most of the callers I've heard.

The position I would like to express regarding HB 3003 is that we must preserve our long-term future of the Permanent Fund. The Permanent Fund was never intended to be a welfare program, nor a short-term fiscal stimulus like the ones we've seen from the federal government in response to the covid crisis, nor an annual payout in a guaranteed amount. It's primary function was instead to provide a stable long-term funding source for our collective needs. The dividend program was an added bonus intended to provide individual Alaskans with a small, reasonable share of the Fund's earnings - when there are earnings - similar to the dividend one might receive from an investment account. It was never intended to provide a payout in a fixed amount, without regard to the status of the Fund's earnings and the collective needs of our state.

In contrast, our state programs, particular our educational programs, are designed to secure and promote the long-term future and progress of our state. If our state government cannot afford to educate its citizens, then what is our future? We must ensure that educational funding - as well as funding for all other essential state services - is stable and sustainable and will grow with the population and needs of the future. This is the vastly more important function of our Permanent Fund, and to deplete this fund simply to give individuals a larger handout for the next few years would be irresponsible and unconscionable.

I am deeply dismayed by the quality of the testimony I am hearing this afternoon, and lack of thought for the future. I appreciate the difficult work you do and the service to our state. Please stand firm to protect the long-term future and growth of Alaska's potential. Please work to increase revenue to our state and stop this unsustainable drain on the Permanent Fund.

Thank you.

Jan Conitz
Fairbanks 99709
[REDACTED]

From: GCI <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:19 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>

Cc: Me <rockinga@gci.net>
Subject: Fwd: Public comment HB 3003

Sent from my iPhone

> My name is Roger Anderson Voter ID: 1102057
> House/Precinct: 29-110
> I am a permanent full time resident of Cooper Landing, Alaska.
> I'm emailing to inform you of my support of HB 3003, Governor Dunleavy's PFD plan.
> Passage of HB 3003 would help all Alaskans, now and for years to come. Please support passage of this House Bill.

> Sincerely,
> Roger Anderson
> [REDACTED]
> [REDACTED]
>

From: Eileen Brado <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:20 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: Re 2021 PFD

I'm writing to express my concern over what has become of our PFD that we are supposed to be getting each year. It's a sad state of affairs when we can have a fund worth 81 million dollars or more and the legislators want to give us zero to 525 dollars? That does not compute! One of the reasons I voted for Governor Dunleavy was that he promised to work for us to get us our full dividend. I am still asking that you give the people our full dividend or give us a good explanation why that cannot happen. Nothing I've heard makes any sense. If the state needs our dividend along with their operating budget something is very wrong and they need to do some cutting somewhere.

Please set this right and help us get get into writing exactly how this should be paid out so that we don't have this wrangling EVERY SINGLE YEAR!

Thank you,
Eileen Brado
[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

From: Matt Winn <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:23 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: PFD

House finance committee. I am writing to tell you to pay us Alaskans our full pfd. We do not support the PFD theft committed by you over these passed several years and insist that you pay us what is owed in its entirety. This is crucial especially now during this crisis we are living through.

Sincerely,...
Matt Winn

From: Judith Ritenburgh <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:23 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: Fwd: PFD

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Judith Ritenburgh <[REDACTED]>
Date: August 24, 2021 at 11:09:13 AM AKDT
To: Representative.Harriet.Drummond@akleg.gov
Subject: PFD

What you are doing is illegal and immoral! Alaskans know what the PFD legislation says, they know the law is still standing, they know legislators should not change 40 year old laws with no input from voters! You are either very stupid or you just have not taken the time to read and understand the PFD! It is NOT, NEVER WAS, AND NEVER MEANT TO BE A PART OF THE ALASKA BUDGET PROCESS!

Return it and save any part of your soul and morality that you might still have! The money in our account belongs solely to citizens! It is our legally legislated money, invested by our legally hired privately owned companies, the interest and excellent management of our team of of private investors is the main reason our private accounts have thrived! Why and by what authority do you have to walk into our private accounts, use our private password and remove money that only belongs to the people of Alaska!

YOU ARE STEALING, IT IS IMMORAL AND ILLEGAL!
GOD AND ALASKANS ARE WATCHING YOU!

From: Melissa Bartels <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:23 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: Pfd

There are so many Alaskans that depend on the Alaskan legislature to help us during rough times right now there's so many families struggling to make ends meet the employment is getting a lot better in Alaska Abbott the Pfd will help put food on the tables and get people caught up on their bills so they can move forward feeling safe happy financially stable please give that Dunleavy what he has proposed of the 2300 for the permanent fund and safeguard the permanent fund for years to come in melissabartels
[REDACTED]

From: Teri Stickler <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:24 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: PFD appropriation

My name is Teri Stickler, I am a registered voter and reside on the Kenai Peninsula. I am sending this email to make my desire known regarding the \$2350.00 PFD plan of Governor Dunleavy. I am in FULL SUPPORT of the Governor on this and pray that the House Finance committee will be also.

Thank you,
Teri Stickler

From: Jennifer Smith <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:25 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: PFD

I am angry as an Alaskan that the state government and the representatives of our state have decided to steal from the people. We deserve the pfd you stole and keep trying to steal from us. If for some reason this year you all can not put away your differences and do what is best for our state you can bet I will not vote for any of you ever again and I will start petitions to get you all removed from office.

From: Sharon Wessels <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:27 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: HB3003

I support Governor Dunlevys PFD plan to pay out \$2350 dividend.
Sharon Wessels

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:27 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: Governor Dunleavy's PFD plan

As an Alaskan, living here for 21 years, I support Governor Dunleavy's plan for this years and years to come, PFD plan. When we moved here, we signed our mineral rights away with a contract with the State and it has been slowly being taken away. Please hear us!!!!
Thank you fir your time.
Sara Brunner

From: James Clark <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:28 PM

To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: Please support the governors PFD Plan

Give it to the people.. Juneau needs to listen to the people..

-Jim Clark

From: DeAnn Monk <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:28 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: 3003

I am supporting Dunleavy's PFD proposal and I am so disgusted that the Alaskan people have to do any of this to keep their PFD. You legislatures are heartless and disgusting and all need to be replaced. All of your paychecks should be taken away and given to the people you have cheated which is all of us Alaskans. Shameful!!!! And shame on all of you.

From: Sharon <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:30 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: HB 3003

I support Gov Dunleavy's PFD plan to include paying Alaskans \$2350.
SharonWessels
Mike Wessels

Esther Reem

Palmer Alaska

We have lived in Alaska since 1975, Palmer since 1976

I'm calling for myself and my family in support of a full PFD that was stolen by Walker and continued theft by you, the lawmakers

I'm not sure if you've been shopping or buying gas lately, but inflation, is out of sight

We are retired, and are living on a fixed income

We don't have the opportunity to just take money from you, like you have done from the Alaskan people

Pay us the full PFD, You owe each Alaskan at least \$10,000

If you don't do that, then at least pay Gov Dunleavy's PFD PLAN OF \$2,350

I pray you will do the right thing for the Alaskan People that you are supposed to represent

From: Daniel Rouggy <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:34 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: PFD

Hi my name is Dan Rouggy. I am email emailing in regards to the PFD and I represent myself and my family. Myself and my family were all born and raised in Alaska We support the full PFD and if we can if you guys cannot come to terms on a full PFD then we support dunleavy's house bill 3003

Thanks.
Dan

From: dawn.lanning.harris [REDACTED] >
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:37 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: PFD

Your duty is to the people of Alaska and to follow the laws put in place. The PFD is already stipulated on how it is to be dispersed. Follow the original formula, ammend it ito the constitution of Alaska. It was always intended for the people to alleviate our hardships on just living here and for the rights to the minerals. You playing games and stalling longer and longer is childish and we are tired of being on the back burner and you taking advantage. You get paid handsomely to represent the people, not to do what you want. I have watched some of you speak, the audacity to say such shameful things about the people you represent and taking the money those people rightly are owed, even back to Walker days. You are the reason people lose there respect for politicians, you lie to our faces to get in and then take all you can. Full payback of the PFD, original formula in our State Constitution permanent. Live within your means, stop taking ours away.

From: Rebecca Case Turner <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:39 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: PFD

Good afternoon,

I wish to express my thoughts regarding a full PFD. I believe it should be capped at &1,200 to \$1,500 until we have a balanced budget.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration.

Sincerely,

Rebecca B Turner
[REDACTED]
Wasilla, AK. 99654

From: george [REDACTED].com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:43 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Cc: george [REDACTED]
Subject: ☆☆☆ 100% Support of a Full PFD ☆☆☆☆

To The Honorable Members of House Finance,

Governor Dunleavy campaigned for a Full PFD, and that is what Alaskans expect, what is being proposed right now is only a small portion of what should be given to all Alaskans.

Personally, I would shut down the government by cutting off all funding and by executive order, stop payment on any funds going to legislators until they complied with the Full PFD Alaskan's are owed and deserve.

If they did a recall on Governor Dunleavy, I do not think that Alaskans would vote him out, in fact, they would support him more for fighting for them and what's owed to them.

May God continue to bless you, your family and all of the lives you touch!

Sincerely,

George LaMoureaux
Managing Director,
Trans Alaska Gas Pipeline, LLC

From: costello_mishell <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:43 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: Regarding the PFD HB3003

My name is Mishell Costello. I'm representing myself. I urge you to support of Gov. Dunleavy's PFD plan - which includes a \$2350 dividend. Thank you.
(HB 3003)

From: Kustura [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:43 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Cc: Mike Mercier <bearranch@mtaonline.net>
Subject: Permanent Fund Testimony reference Permanent Fund

I am writing today in support of Governor Dunleavy's proposed \$2,350, per person, dividend. I was not able to get through on the phone line to give my public testimony.

The last few years the legislature's use of the citizen's permanent fund is unlawful. The legislature has acted without any consideration for the law and the rights of the citizens. Frankly, the arrogance and misuse of power by the majority of this body is disgraceful. Do your job and represent your constituents, not the SWAMP.

Georgia Kustura
[REDACTED]

Chugiak, AK

From: Elise Sorum-Birk <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:44 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: FW: Governor's Plan

Please include the below email from one of Rep. Josephson's constituents in public testimony for HB 3003.

Thanks,
Elise

From: red bradley <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 2:11 PM
To: Sen. Elvi Gray-Jackson <Sen.Elvi.Gray-Jackson@akleg.gov>; Rep. Andy Josephson <Rep.Andy.Josephson@akleg.gov>
Subject: Governor's Plan

Please enter this into the public comments collected today.

As a 50 year resident I can no longer support the annual PFD payout. It was never a "right", nor was it intended to last forever.

The PFD is to protect our grandkids and theirs, but will drain the coffers unless we stop it now. The annual giving to the citizenry is unsustainable.

Vote to protect the fund by saying no to the governor and yes to my 16 grandchildren.

red bradley
[REDACTED]
Anchorage, Alaska 99508
[REDACTED]

From: Yolanda Hernandez <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:46 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: PFD

I feel the the people should vote on the PFD, I also want a statutory PFD I'm am representing My family.

I have emailed numerous times regarding the PFD, we alaskans have all taking a hit do to covid it's now you show support and help alaskans and stop kicking the can down the road.

From: Karen Fedelem <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:47 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: Please vote for full PFDs

Please follow the law and vote for full PFDs.

Thank you,
Karen Fedelem

From: Dawn Lanning <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:47 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: Full PFD

To all of the people sitting in the chairs we put you in, you are there because the people of Alaska believed you during your campaigns. You were going to be there for all the Alaskans and get things done the way we wanted it. We do allow a lot of leeway for your positions and I am sure it is not always easy. I have to say most of you are creating a s#it show. We ask only that you do things by the law and constitution, it is not that hard, unless you are being unlawful and don't care about our constitutional rights. If that is the case, so be it, we will vote you out and we will replace and your legacy as a legislature will always be what a crap job you did for the people of Alaska. You have wasted hundreds of thousands of dollars of money for your special sessions, which will be in your bank accounts to live easily off of. While as Natasha says we got 2000.00 and our greed is unfathomable, we work twice as hard here, we live twice as hard here and people who come from well off families should not spew such poison, it makes her sound like she is entitled and being her family is so rich she does not have to censor herself. PFD belongs to the people. The budget is to be done after the PFD. We will not accept 50/50, original formula per Hammond, it is already in the Constitution how it is to be used for the maximum benefit of all Alaskans. Be men and women of character, stand up for the people who stood up for you. Special interests do not interest us or benefit us in any way that is your pockets that get lined and if you are there for yourselves, then you and many others are why we do not trust or believe in politicians anymore. You have become deceitful and we have lost our ability to believe anything you say. You all are crying wolf to much, we are realizing you are the wolves. Do better or move on, especially you Natasha, you can move anywhere and be comfortable, no one here will miss you.
Thank you for reading this, if you even did.
Trust issues and such from your actions in the past.

From: Greg Bliss <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:48 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: PFD

Pay us back our full PFD past and present !

From: Marlena Tufford <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:49 PM

To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: Testimony

The last six years the PFD has been having a difficult time sticking to its original mission, to be there for Alaskans. It is on our land that it comes from and should at least be a 50-50 and placed in the constitution. Alaskans now, more than ever, need public officials to stand side by side with the majority!! Allow the majority of the people to make the choice, not only a small amount of public officials. Hear us now.

Covid has worsened everybody's life. Back pay would help the common people catch up on bills that have stacked up, loss of jobs, increase need for food for children due to lack of in person school services, increased need for items for children needing to home school who have special needs and cannot tolerate masking to be in school.

My family originates from Unalakleet and the PFD helps alleviate some of the struggling of every day needs. The last several years they have needed to conserve water, wearing dirty clothes due to not have items needed to create a new water system or fix the old one.

The legislature should also be on the road system. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Marlena Tufford

[REDACTED]

North Pole, Alaska, 99705

[REDACTED]

Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:49 PM

To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>

Subject: Budget and PFD

My name is Dan Martin. I have been an Alaska resident since June 1974. Moved to Alaska in 1973 as active duty CG. I did 1 3 year tour in Oregon, mid 70's, before PFD, and 1 year

in California for 1 year , 1980-81, I moved back to Alaska with my wife in 1982.

We both collected the first dividend, and have lived in Alaska ever since, and collected every dividend.

We have never depended on that money, always considered it "found" money and used it for "toys" etc.

I also remember a state income tax back then. I don't get the reluctance of our elected officials to consider a payroll tax. A tax that would get some money from all the non resident

seasonal workers, oil field workers, fisheries, mining etc.

A state sales tax is regressive and will only hurt low income families.

I'm personally more concerned with funding and maintaining the marine highways vessels,

etc, than I am with a dividend.

What most of the people commenting and crying about not getting "their" money don't know is that Jay Hammond said his plan for the dividend was to get most of it back in the form of user fees, etc. I'd gladly give up the dividend for reliable, consistent ferry service in Alaska. I live in Tenakee Springs, by choice, and we depend on the ferry for travel, especially in the winter months when weather more often than not precludes flying.

From: Eliazar Damian <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:50 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: We want the FULL PFD

I'm a taxpaying resident of AK. Especially at this point in the year that PFD comes in handy. The math makes sense and we can do it. Let the governor do his job and pass the bill please. I have two kids and a wife to feed and I'm not going to be a millionaire anytime soon at my regular ass job. So if you would please put the people first and do as we demand that would be great. Pass the full PFD.

From: David Horning <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:51 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: - PFD Comments

My name is David Horning from Meadow Lakes. I am representing my wife and my 4 children. I am emailing to voice my strong support for a full constitutionally protected PFD. I will also support Gov. Dunleavy's proposal. The PFD's are extremely important to our family and many other families here in Alaska. My children save their PDF's and they are using them to pay for their college housing, tuition and books. Many of us get extremely frustrated when it appears that you assume Alaskan's will make poor decisions on how to spend their small share of resource money. Please be advised that a great many of us are watching extremely closely how you deal with this issue and we will be voting accordingly.

David Horning

From: Sabrina Garcia <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:51 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: Full pfd

Good afternoon, members of the House Finance Committee. I'm Sabrina Garcia representing myself. Regretfully, I'm opposed to HB3003A for the primary reason that your appropriation amount for the people's PFD is underfunded, according to the traditional statutory PFD distribution law.

This bill is a compromise between the traditional statutory PFD distribution law and SB 26. SB 26 continues to cause annual hassles over the amount that Alaskans should receive for their PFD. I don't like SB 26 and I don't like this compromise. I want the FULL PFD.

If you legislators would use the traditional statutory PFD distribution law, which you have ignored for over 5 years now, we Alaskans can get our legal FULL \$3,687 PFD this year. Based upon 630,000 applicants for this year, the overall amount appropriated from the Earnings Reserve Account would be about \$2.3 B. That would also allow you to appropriate a like amount from the ERA for state government, which is Hammond's 50/50 plan, which would cover your anticipated budget deficit of between \$1.6 B to \$2 B with some money left over, which you could transfer to the CBR. There is enough money in the ERA, over \$15 B as of July, to do both of these functions without putting new taxes on the people or the private business sector or jeopardizing essential state services.

Repeal SB 26. Keep the Earnings Reserve Account as a pivot savings account that receives Permanent Fund investment income and from which distributes the PFD and money for state government, and can also be used for state or regional emergencies. Keep the traditional statutory PFD distribution law, and pay the people what you owe them. For this year, that would be about \$3,687, and you also owe us the back PFDs of over \$10,000 per person, too. If you eliminate the ERA through proposed constitutional amendments or statutory bills that would transfer its balance to the Permanent Fund corpus, then you would be denying the people the ability to recover our back PFDs.

Alaskans are hurting. FULL PFD NOW or the people will vote for a Constitutional Convention next year. Thank you.

From: Michael Wills <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:51 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: I strongly support the proposal from Gov Dunleavy

Hello,

I'm Michael Wills at 8719 N Wolverine Rd, Palmer AK 99645. The disconnect in Juneau from the will of the people regarding the PFD has gone on long enough. Put this to a vote before the public and be done with the dysfunction. The Governor's plan may not restore the original intent of the program but it has the desired effect of keeping the residents of Alaska as invested beneficiaries to act as a check on the legislature. The time for a vote to protect the PFD is long overdue.

v/r

Michael Wills
[REDACTED]

From: EK C <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:54 PM

To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: NO new taxes

Please please please no new taxes for Alaskans. We are already hurting financially. Hold back on the pfd if that is going to cause an increase in taxes. Expand the pfd to all Alaskans not just those who have lived here awhile. We've been here 11 months and my husband is a healthcare worker. We could definitely use a financial boost and healthcare employees are tired and aren't getting any recognition. Bottom line though is no new taxes. No new taxes please.

Thank you
Katy Cullison
Eagle River

From: Juanita Stucker <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:54 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: PFD

Please agree too governor amour of \$2350.00 this will help my family.
I'm sure if you were me you would do the same as I am writing to support governor amount.
PFD was created for Alaskans people not for the government to steal from Alaskans.

From: Jim Costello <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:56 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: Governor Plan

We support the Governor Dunleavy plan which includes a \$2350 payment this year. The PFD was never intended to be political. Yet Juneau year after year makes it front and center drama. That must end. Also, all outstanding payments must be made to ALL Alaskans. Thank You.

James Costello
John Costello
Alexis Costello
Tyus Sikorski

From: Cindy <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:56 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: PFD

I'd like to reply re: Governor Dunlevy's proposed PFD amount. I think it is too much and would bankrupt the state. Funding essential state duties is more important. When did we become such a socialist state?

From: tamia cornelius <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:58 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: PFD

Myself as a born and raised Alaskan need you the public servant get rid of government raiding the PFD as your government bank.

It was never built to be used this way period.

You need to restore the full PFD back to the citizens of Alaska.

From: Jerry L Jordan <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:59 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Cc: Sen. Roger Holland <Senator.Roger.Holland@akleg.gov>; Rep. James Kaufman <Rep.James.Kaufman@akleg.gov>
Subject: PFD Testimony

I'm testifying on behalf of myself and my wife (Starla Jordan). We have lived in Alaska since moving up with the Air Force in 1997. We fell in love with Alaska and made Anchorage our permanent home. When we received the PFD in the past, it was a shot in the arm that allowed us (including two children at the time) to travel and meet other expenses.

I support a full statutory PFD as it has been calculated for many decades without fail. Why did it all of a sudden become an issue that it couldn't be paid? Because greedy legislatures wanted more and mismanaged funds currently available to them. As I have read, the legislature never really made cuts but simply shuffled funds around to make it appear as if there were cuts. When I had a reduction in pay when I left the military, we made adjustments to compensate. It appears our government at all levels never cut because it is not their money and it is always easier to spend other people's money.

I also support a full re-payment of past amounts.

This will provide a shot in the arm for small business and families that have been hit hard during the COVID pandemic.

As I do not see our legislature getting their act together to do the right thing and I have been disgusted by some of previous and current legislatures opinion on this matter, therefore I will support Governor Dunleavy's current plan as a compromise.

I worked hard to spread the word to about former Rep. Johnston and former Sen. Giessel and encouraged others to vote for Sen. Holland and Rep. Kaufmann. I also contributed the first time ever to a campaign during that time. I am a super voter and will do all I can to continue to encourage others to vote against anyone that disregards our wishes.

Years ago, I recall an advisory vote on whether the PFD should be used for government spending and it was overwhelmingly voted down. It appears that again our legislature is not listening to us and as I hear the testimony live now I only hope they wake up!

The Permanent Fund grew by nearly 25% last year, there is no reason not to pay a full statutory PFD.

Jerry L. Jordan

From: Allen Bailey <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 4:24 PM
To: House Finance <House.Finance@akleg.gov>
Subject: re: HB 3003 funding for Alaska Legal Services

Members of the Alaska House Finance Committee:

I grew up in Alaska and am an attorney who has spent most of his 47-year career in legal cases, both criminal and civil, that involved domestic violence. I ask members of the Finance Committee to legislatively reverse the governor's veto of \$400,000 in funding for the Alaska Legal Services Corporation. Funding for ALSC is very important to the population of our state, since Alaska has long had among the highest rates of intimate partner violence and sexual assault in the nation. The expense to the state of providing legal services to survivors of domestic violence is a likely to be exceeded by **reductions** in the costs of social services, court expenses and law enforcement that are caused by those who abuse other family members.

I am aware of research in the U.S. that has determined that the single most effective thing that society can do for an intimate partner violence survivor **that actually reduces the likelihood of being re-victimized** is to provide him or her with access to civil legal services. In fact, in a study by Farmer and Tiefenthaler, the provision by counties of access to free legal services actually resulted in a net savings for the counties related to processes dealing with such matters. A PDF of their published summary is attached. Other support for this proposition is set out in the attached "domestic-violence" PDF. As a long-time volunteer in providing legal services to survivors of intimate partner violence (Alaska Attorney General's Pro Bono Award, 2011), I am also aware that state funding for such legal representation has long been inadequate.

Although I recently retired from the active practice of family law in Alaska, the costs and societal effects of domestic violence affect all of us as residents of our state, and women in Alaska Native populations are victimized at even higher rates than others. Alaska Legal Services Corp. is a necessary provider of services to intimate partner violence survivors.

I am a former member of the American Bar Association's Commission on Domestic and Sexual Violence (2003-06) and liaison to that commission from the ABA Family Law Section for the past 15 years; a former member and past president of the board of directors of AWAIC, Inc., the largest DV shelter in Alaska; and former chair of the Child Custody and Domestic Violence Committees of the ABA Family Law Section.

Allen M. Bailey, Esq.
[REDACTED]

Anchorage, Alaska 99515
[REDACTED]

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention reports that in the U.S., 36.4 percent of women and 33.6 percent of men experience sexual or physical violence or stalking perpetrated by an intimate partner in their lifetimes.¹ Individuals who have experienced domestic violence display a multitude of legal needs. They may require assistance with filing protection orders, custody issues, housing, identity theft, and employment (Lee & Backes, 2018; Allen et al., 2004).

Page 1 of this research brief provides some research highlights; pages 2-3 a narrative overview; page 4 a featured federal resource; page 5 other helpful resources; page 6 endnotes; and pages 7-15 summaries of the curated studies. All endnotes are to sources not included in our summaries section.

RESEARCH HIGHLIGHTS:

- “Providing civil counsel in divorce, custody, and protective order proceedings can significantly improve outcomes for DV [domestic violence] and IPV [intimate partner violence] victims and their children as well as serve as a cost-effective strategy for reducing violence and generating positive social norms” (Lee & Backes, 2018).
- In a study of survivors of IPV, researchers concluded that “[c]ivil legal services can most directly address economic self-sufficiency in two ways: by increasing income and decreasing economic liability” (Hartley & Renner, 2016).
- “83 percent of victims represented by an attorney successfully obtained a protective order, as compared to just 32 percent of victims without an attorney” (Institute for Policy Integrity, 2015).
- In custody matters, “attorney representation, particularly representation by legal aid attorneys with expertise in IPV cases, resulted in greater protections being awarded to IPV victims and their children. Improved access of IPV victims to legal representation, particularly by attorneys with expertise in IPV, is indicated” (Kernic, 2015).
- “DV/SA [sexual assault] victims reported an aggregate total of 3,446 separate legal problems in areas identified in the survey instrument with an average of 19.69 legal problems per household/respondent. This is 2 times higher than an average of 9.3 problems per household/year documented for the general low-income population of Washington” (Social & Economic Sciences Research Center, 2014).
- “In 2003, for example, requests for restraining orders in Dane County were granted approximately 55 percent of the time. With the aid of a legal advocate provided by DAIS, however, that number increased to 69 percent” (Elwart et al., 2006).
- “Women living in counties with shelters, hot-lines, safe homes, emergency transportation, programs for batterers, children’s programs, and counseling are not significantly less likely to be victims of intimate partner abuse than women who live in counties without these services. However, women who live in counties with legal assistance programs to help battered women are significantly less likely to report abuse” (Allen et al., 2004).
- “... [T]he overwhelming fraction of our study participants did not achieve the goal of terminating their marriages unless they had lawyers” (Degnan et al., 2019).
- “Most services provided to help battered women do not impact the likelihood of abuse, but the provision of legal services significantly lowers the incidence of domestic violence” (Farmer & Tiefenthaler, 2003).

NARRATIVE OVERVIEW RE: ASSISTING DOMESTIC VIOLENCE SURVIVORS

Domestic violence (DV) is defined as violent, often aggressive, behavior used by one partner in a relationship that incites fear and intimidates the other partner or among family members. The U.S. Department of Justice Bureau of Justice Statistics differentiates between DV (violence from family members and former or current partners) and IPV (violence only from current or former partners).² Experiencing violence can leave a profound impact. Those who have been directly victimized report higher rates of depression,³ are at higher risk for repeat victimization,⁴ and are at higher risk for perpetrating DV in their lifetimes⁵ than those who have not experienced violence.

Experiencing IPV/DV is common: The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention reports that in the U.S., 36.4 percent of women and 33.6 percent of men experience sexual or physical violence or stalking perpetrated by an intimate partner in their lifetimes.⁶ In 2017, data from the National Crime Victimization Survey found that 1,237,960 Americans had experienced DV in the six months prior to the survey.⁷

IPV/DV has disproportionate effects on elderly, disabled, LGBTQ, minority and low-income people due to increased social risks associated with violence and decreased access to services. One study found that, while 6 to 12 percent of older adults self-identify as being abused, the actual number of participants reporting indicators of abuse was about five times greater. A published review reported that, in comparison to non-Hispanic White women, Black, Latina, and Native American/Alaska Native women experienced higher lifetime rates of IPV associated with various mental health disorders, reproductive health outcomes, and barriers to services. These barriers are often the result of trauma, housing instability, employment needs, and compounding mental and physical health needs experienced in historically marginalized communities. Additional evidence shows that even when survivors in vulnerable populations have access to legal interventions intended to reduce future risk of harm, they may be less protected from revictimization. For example, Benitez, McNiel & Binder (2010) found that Black women were at elevated risk of renewed abuse after legal intervention (i.e., obtaining a protection order or the arrest of their abusive partner following a DV incident) compared to white women.⁸

DATA AND STUDIES SHOW LEGAL AID HELPS:

Individuals who have experienced domestic violence often display a multitude of legal needs: from assistance with filing protection orders, custody issues, housing, identity theft, and employment (Lee & Backes, 2018; Allen et al., 2004). Domestic violence survivors and sexual assault survivors are likely to report more legal needs than the average low-income household (Social & Economic Sciences Research Center, 2014). Studies show how access to legal aid can both reduce domestic violence and mitigate some of its collateral consequences. Kernic (2015) found that when DV survivors have access to legal representation in child custody cases, they are granted greater protections and visitation decisions when compared to those who are not represented. Another study agrees. The National Network to End Domestic Violence (2017) found in their survey of 1,762 shelters that DV survivors without legal representation are more likely to be later victimized than those without access to legal representation.

Having access to legal representation reduces the likelihood of future violence. In their seminal study, Farmer and Tiefenthaler (2003) found that increased access to legal representation and services is partly responsible for the decrease in domestic violence observed in the 1990s. More recently, Hartley and Renner found that with legal representation to obtain a protective order or on a family law issue, survivors of domestic violence in Iowa saw increases in monthly income and personal growth and support (2018). They also found that, while receiving free civil legal services for intimate partner violence, depression and PTSD decreased significantly over one year (Renner & Hartley, 2018).

The Institute for Policy Integrity (2015) also found that providing legal services to DV survivors reduced domestic violence, as well as the societal costs of domestic violence. Elwart and colleagues (2006) found that when state funding of domestic violence service providers was at \$9.1 million, the maximum benefits were \$27.3 million.

FEATURED FEDERAL RESOURCE:

U.S. Department of Justice, Office for Victims of Crime *Vision 21 Report*

Vision 21: Transforming Victim Services (TVS) outlines a comprehensive and systematic approach to change how we meet victims' needs. TVS grew out of a series of meetings that were sponsored by OVC. The discussion and research focused on the role of victim assistance, how to better serve victims, addressing issues in the field, and identify emerging issues in the field.

This report dedicates an entire chapter to meeting the holistic legal needs of crime victims. The TVS statement reads: "Every state will establish wraparound legal networks that will help ensure that crime victims' rights are enforced and that victims of crime receive the broad range of legal services needed to help rebuild their lives in the aftermath of crime" (p. 9). This chapter summarized efforts made within the last decade to secure crime victims' rights, the difficulties victims face in navigating the justice system, and ways that legal networks can better address crime victims' needs.

Highlights:

- "A staggering 42 percent of victims never report serious violent crime to law enforcement. We need to know why. Stakeholders described a maze of overlapping, complex legal issues facing victims; for example, a single victimization can involve immigration status, civil legal assistance, administrative law remedies, and rights enforcement" (p. vi).
- "Victims of crime all too often face a perplexing maze of coexisting, overlapping, and complex legal issues after their victimization. They must navigate multiple systems (i.e., the criminal, civil, and administrative justice systems), each with its own requirements and processes. One case of victimization may produce myriad legal issues for the victim, including orders of protection, victims' rights enforcement, compensation, employment, housing, home foreclosure, spousal support, and child custody, visitation, and dependency" (p. 12).
- "Serving crime victims in indigenous communities presents a special challenge to all members of the victim service community, particularly providers of legal services. American Indian and Alaska Native populations suffer significantly higher crime rates than the rest of the Nation—a fact that underscores the urgency of finding ways to deliver services more successfully or, in the case of legal assistance, to deliver services at all" (p. 12).
- "Compounding the lack of legal representation for crime victims is the absence of a single point of entry through which victims of all types of crime may access services to address the wide range of legal needs they may have as the result of their victimization" (p. 14).
- "A coordinated, collaborative, and holistic legal response has the potential to serve victims far better through an inherent capacity to provide the type of legal assistance needed at any given time. A network approach would also ensure that victims are connected to community legal resources that can help them address their administrative, civil, and other legal issues" (p. 14).

Access this resource at: US Department of Justice, Office for Victims of Crime. *Vision 21: Transforming Victim Services* (May 2013), available at https://ovc.ncjrs.gov/vision21/pdfs/Vision21_Report.pdf

HELPFUL RESOURCES:

- The Justice in Government Project (JGP) and National Legal Aid & Defenders Association (NLADA), with contributions from the ABA Commission on Domestic & Sexual Violence, published a [newsletter](#) summarizing research and resources related to how civil legal aid assists survivors of domestic violence.⁹
- The Status of Women in the United States has an [interactive map](#), ranking, and grading system for protections afforded to domestic violence survivors.¹⁰
- The [National Coalition Against Domestic Violence](#) has state-by-state statistics and domestic violence fact sheets.¹¹
- The Bureau of Justice Statistics updates their [website](#) with the latest data from the National Crime Victimization Survey, which includes information on DV victimization.¹²
- ABA Commission on Domestic & Sexual Violence (“CDSV”) offers a wide array of [resources and guidance](#) for attorneys representing survivors of domestic and sexual violence through its [publications](#), [POWER Act toolkit](#), [Survivor Reentry Project](#), [LGBT+ Legal Access Project](#) and [listservs](#) for litigators, managers in the legal profession, and advocates for federal policy priorities that advance the provision of legal services for survivors.¹³
- Jacqueline G. Lee of Boise State University and Bethany L. Backes of The University of Texas published a [comprehensive review](#) of the existing literature on civil legal aid’s application for DV and IPV survivors in the Journal of Family Violence in August 2018. The paper also includes recommendations for improving service delivery.¹⁴
- In October 2020, the [Northwest Justice Project](#) submitted [comments for the DOJ OVW Task Force meeting](#) on violence against American Indian and Alaska Native women. These comments provide model advocacy language for legal aid organizations serving AI/AN survivors.
- Legal Services Corporation has collected client success stories [here](#).¹⁵
- For more information about civil legal aid messaging, communications, and story-telling, go to the [Voices for Civil Justice](#) and [All Rise for Civil Justice](#) websites.¹⁶
- For a more comprehensive repository of legal aid related research, go to the National Legal Aid & Defender Association’s [LegalAidResearch](#) website.¹⁷

Endnotes

¹ Sharon G. Smith et al., *The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS): 2015 Data Brief – Updated Release*, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2018), available at <https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/2015data-brief508.pdf>

² Rachel E. Morgan & Jennifer L. Truman, *Crime Victimization, 2017*, U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics (2018), available at <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/cv17.pdf>

³ Jeanne Y. Choe et al., *Perpetration of Violence, Violent Victimization, and Severe Mental Illness: Balancing Public Health Concerns*, 59 *Psychiatr. Serv.* 153. (2008).

⁴ Amaia Iratzoqui, *Strain and Opportunity: A Theory of Repeat Victimization*, 33 *J. of Interpersonal Violence* 1366 (2018).

⁵ Richard B. Felson & Kelsea Jo Lane, *Social Learning, Sexual and Physical Abuse, and Adult Crime*, 35 *Aggressive Behavior* 489 (2009).

⁶ *Supra* note 1.

⁷ *Supra* note 5.

⁸ Christopher T. Benitez, Dale E. McNiel, & Renee L. Binder, *Do Protection Orders Protect?*, 38(3) *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*. 376-385 (2010), available at <http://jaapl.org/content/38/3/376#:~:text=Protection%20orders%20are%20widely%20used,be%20a%20threat%20to%20another.&text=Alt%20hough%20protection%20orders%20are%20not,useful%20role%20in%20threat%20management>.

⁹ <https://mailchi.mp/55a738925699/justresearchjuly2020>

¹⁰ <https://statusofwomendata.org/explore-the-data/violence-safety/#section-0>

¹¹ <https://ncadv.org/statistics>

¹² <https://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=dcdetail&iid=245>

¹³ See https://www.americanbar.org/groups/domestic_violence/Initiatives/;

https://www.americanbar.org/groups/domestic_violence/Initiatives/publications/;

https://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/administrative/probono_public_service/power-toolkit-8-30-19.pdf;

https://www.americanbar.org/groups/domestic_violence/Initiatives/survivor-reentry-project/;

https://www.americanbar.org/groups/domestic_violence/Initiatives/lgbt-legal-access/; and

https://www.americanbar.org/groups/domestic_violence/listservs/

¹⁴ <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10896-018-9974-3>

¹⁵ <https://www.lsc.gov/what-legal-aid/client-success-stories>

¹⁶ See <https://voicesforciviljustice.org/> and <https://www.allriseforciviljustice.org/>

¹⁷ <https://legalaidresearch.org/>

SUMMARIES OF KEY STUDIES

1. Ellen Degnan, Thomas Ferriss, D. James Greiner, & Roseanna Sommers, *Trapped in Marriage* (2019), available at https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3277900

The researchers conducted a randomized control trial to assess the effectiveness of a pro bono divorce service offered from January 2011 through July 2016. They randomly assigned 311 individuals seeking assistance to obtain a divorce to either a service provider to find a pro bono attorney (the treatment group), or to an existing set of self-help resources paired with the opportunity for assistance over the telephone (the control group). They found that 54.1 percent of individuals who were referred to a service provider to find an attorney had a divorce case on record after eighteen months, compared to 13.9 percent of the control group. After three years, 45.9 percent of the treatment group had successfully obtained a divorce, compared to 8.9 percent of the control group.

Methodology:

Individuals seeking a divorce were randomly assigned to be referred to either a service to obtain an attorney, or self-help resources. The researchers compared the rates of successfully filing for and obtaining a divorce at two time periods after randomization (eighteen months and three years) between the two groups.

Highlights:

- “Our simple design study replicated that of previous effect-of-representation studies: we randomized participants to a higher level of service or a lower level of service and followed results via examination of adjudicatory system records” (p. 24).
- “Study intake lasted from January 2011 until July of 2013, allowing us to randomize 311 participants, 74 assigned to the treatment group and 237 to control” (p. 24).
- “Starting eighteen months after randomization, on a periodic basis, we provided personal identifying information on study participants to the Court’s remarkably patient and dedicated staff, who searched for divorce case files involving study participants. Upon finding a file, Court staff copied it, redacted confidential information about the opposing spouse, and sent the redacted copy to us. With respect to study participants who had case files in the initial 18month search, we requested follow-up documents from the court for up to 36 months after randomization. A review of these case files provided us with a primary source of outcome information” (p. 25).
- In Philadelphia County: “Eighteen months after randomization, 54.1% of the treated group, as opposed to 13.9% of the control group, had a divorce case on record. Three years after randomization, 45.9% of treated group, as opposed to 8.9% of the control group, had achieved a termination of a marriage” (p. 5).
- If results are expanded to include other counties in Pennsylvania, “results remain statistically and substantively significant: 60.8% of the treated group, versus 36.3% of the control group, had a divorce case on file after 18 months, $p < .00002$; 50.0% of the treated group, versus 25.3% of the control group, succeeded in terminating the marriage in 36 months, $p < .00002$ ” (p. 6).
- “We conclude that the applicable procedural system trapped participants in marriage, even those seeking only the simplest possible court action, i.e., orders ending marriages and doing nothing else with respect to that marriage” (p. 7).
- “... the overwhelming fraction of our study participants did not achieve the goal of terminating their marriages unless they had lawyers” (p. 9).

2. Carolyn Copps Hartley & Lynette M. Renner, *Economic Self-Sufficiency among Women Who Experienced Intimate Partner Violence and Received Civil Legal Services* (2018), *Journal of Family Violence* 33(7), available at <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs10896-018-9977-0>

Panel data was collected from 85 women who experienced intimate partner violence and received free civil legal services from Iowa Legal Aid (ILA). The researchers compared the women's income and levels of self-sufficiency over a period of one year to determine the effects of receiving civil legal services. They found that between Waves 1 and 3, the women's average monthly income increased by 19.52 percent and they reported significant increases in personal growth and support. However, the researchers did not identify a relationship between the type or amount of legal services received and changes in economic self-sufficiency. The authors also published a complementary study on the effects of civil legal services on psychological well-being using the same dataset (summary 3).

Methodology:

Over a period of one year, panel data was collected from 85 women who experienced intimate partner violence and received free civil legal services from ILA. Baseline data was first collected at Wave 1, and then Wave 2 and Wave 3 follow-up interviews took place every six months. A randomized control trial method was not used due to the potential safety risks of being assigned to a non-intervention group. The researchers compared the women's economic status (measured as total monthly income and social service utilization), levels of self-sufficiency (measured by the women's perceptions of ability to live on their income), and type and amount of legal services received between waves.

Highlights:

- "With the significant negative economic impact of IPV, it is reasonable to assume that reducing incidents of IPV would decrease these effects and researchers have shown that providing civil legal services reduces IPV."
- "Women's concrete economic indicators, income and program assistance use, changed from Wave 1 to Wave 3; perhaps most notably, women's average monthly income increased by 19.52% between Waves 1 and 3."
- "Changes in the measures of some of the domains of economic self-sufficiency were mixed. Women's perceptions of the difficulty living off their current income decreased over time but their reports of the adequacy of family resources for physical, health, and housing necessities (food, clothing, housing, heat, transportation, phone access, dental and medical care), intra-family support, and child care did not change. This was likely due to the fact that most women reported these resources to be sufficiently adequate at Wave 1."
- "Women reported significant increases in the adequacy in personal growth and support (time for personal growth and money for extras like family entertainment or travel) and overall adequacy of family resources as measured by the total [Family Resource Scale]."
- "For the positive changes in women's economic situations over a one-year period of time, however, we found no relation between the type or amount of legal services received and changes in the economic self-sufficiency measures."

3. Lynette M. Renner & Carolyn Copps Hartley, *Psychological Well-Being Among Women Who Experienced Intimate Partner Violence and Received Civil Legal Services* (2018), *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, available at https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/0886260518777552?url_ver=Z39.88-2003&rfr_id=ori%3Arid%3Acrossref.org&rfr_dat=cr_pub%3Dpubmed

Panel data was collected from 85 women who experienced intimate partner violence and received free civil legal services from Iowa Legal Aid (ILA). The researchers compared the women's results on various measures of psychological well-being over a period of one year to determine the effects of receiving civil legal services. They found that between Waves 1 and 3, the women's depression score decreased by 19.83 percent, PTSD symptoms decreased between 39 to 46 percent, and appraisal support (the perceived ability to discuss issues of personal importance) increased by 5.95 percent. However, there was no correlation between these outcomes and the type or amount of legal services received. The authors also published a complementary study on the effects of civil legal services on economic self-sufficiency using the same dataset (summary 2).

Methodology:

Over a period of one year, panel data was collected from 85 women who experienced intimate partner violence and received free civil legal services from ILA. Baseline data was first collected at Wave 1, and then Wave 2 and Wave 3 follow-up interviews took place every six months. A randomized control trial method was not used due to the potential safety risks of being assigned to a non-intervention group. The researchers compared the women's psychological well-being (measured using high-validity psychometric tests for depression, PTSD, support, resilience, goal-directed thinking, and empowerment), and type and amount of legal services received between waves.

Highlights:

- “At the Wave 1 interview, many women reported psychological well-being scores that might raise clinical concerns. Sixty-seven percent of women met the clinical criteria for depression and 64% of women met the clinical criteria for PTSD. Women reported modest levels of social support and resilience; and, despite the presence of IPV, depressive symptoms, and PTSD symptoms, most women still reported adequate levels of goal-directed thinking and empowerment.”
- “Women's depressive symptom score decreased by 19.83% between Wave 1 and Wave 3, and significant decreases in PTSD symptoms were also reported over this same one-year period (decreases in intrusion, avoidance, and hyperarousal scores were 43.95%, 39.61%, and 46.35%, respectively).”
- “Women's goal-oriented thinking, resilience, and social support levels did not significantly change from Waves 1 to 3, with the exception of scores on the Appraisal Support subscale, which increased by 5.95% over a one-year period.”
- “Our overall hypothesis was supported by the fact that women showed improvements in various facets of psychological well-being over time, although we found no relation between the type or amount of legal services received and changes in women's depressive symptoms, traumatic stress responses, or other measures of well-being.”

4. National Network to End Domestic Violence, *11th Annual Domestic Violence Counts Report (2017)*, available at <https://nnedv.org/content/domestic-violence-counts-11th-annual-census-report/>

The National Network to End Domestic Violence conducted a census of their 1,762 shelters and found that domestic violence survivors without legal representation are frequently further victimized and endangered. The same shelters also reported having to cut legal services due to staffing and lack of resources. This has led to domestic violence survivors representing themselves at court and unable to secure civil protective orders. The National Network to End Domestic Violence is one of the largest national service providers for domestic violence survivors. They receive the majority of their funding from government grants (54.66%), corporate grants (25.53%), contracts and consulting (7.05%), and membership dues (6.70%). Including this study in the summary shows what happens on the other side—

expanding legal services is shown in other studies to improve legal outcomes for domestic violence survivors, but this study shows that cutting services has the opposite effect.

Methodology:

The National Network to End Domestic Violence contacted all the domestic violence shelters in the US. They received a response rate of 92 percent and received responses from 1,762 shelters.

Highlights:

- 52 percent of the National Network to End Domestic Violence shelters were providing court accompaniment and legal advocacy for civil protection orders, but only 12 percent of the programs can help victims with legal representation. In 2017, the shelters cut 34 programs that provided legal representation by an attorney and 29 additional programs reduced or eliminated their legal advocacy programs.
- They report that funding for much-needed legal services is stretched thin. In Indiana, one advocate said, “Our program often sees more people than we can help on any given day. On Census Day, our Protective Order Advocate was working with four survivors on protective orders. A fifth survivor came in for help filing a protection order, but [the advocate] did not have time to wait and left before we could serve her” (p. 9).
- Another Oregon advocate spoke of the restrictions for victims when receiving legal aid, “One client does not qualify for Legal Aid, and also cannot afford an attorney even at a modest price. She will likely have to represent herself against her abuser” (p. 10).

5. Carolyn Copps Hartley, Ph.D., Lynette M. Renner, Ph.D. *The Longer-Term Influence of Civil Legal Services on Battered Women (2016)*, Technical Report for the National Institute of Justice Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice, available at <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/249879.pdf>

This research, funded by a National Institute of Justice Office of Justice Programs grant, examines the key outcomes of civil legal services on female victims of IPV. Panel data was collected from 85 women who experienced intimate partner violence and received free civil legal services from Iowa Legal Aid (ILA). The researchers compared the women’s results to examine how the provision of family law services and civil protective orders influences revictimization, psychological well-being and economic self-sufficiency over time. From Waves 1 to 3, women experienced a decrease in physical violence, stalking, and symptoms of depression and PTSD. Women also reported increased family resources and income and decreased financial difficulty and assistance resources used. Increased empowerment was associated with improved levels of psychological well-being and economic self-sufficiency.

- “On average, women reported substantially less physical violence between Waves 1 and 2, and this decrease held over to Waves 3 through 5. Women also reported a significant decrease in emotional/verbal abuse and stalking behaviors between Wave 1 and Wave 3...[I]t appears that civil legal services for both family law cases and protective orders have a similar effect on women’s reported revictimization over time.” (p. 78)
- “Women’s economic situation improved from Wave 1 to Wave 3. Between Waves 1 and 3, women reported a statistically significant increase in the adequacy of their family resources as measured by the total FRS. Women also reported a decrease in difficulty living on their current income, an increase in monthly income, and a decrease in the number of assistance resources used.” (p. 79)
- “The results also show that the quality of the attorney-client relationship is highly correlated with women’s empowerment, particularly at later time points.” (p. 79)
- “... it appears that women’s increases in empowerment have substantial gain on their later mental health, resilience, and financial stability but are unrelated to their revictimization.” (p. 80)
- “Civil legal services can most directly address economic self-sufficiency in two ways: by increasing income and decreasing economic liability.” (p. 85)

- “Although civil legal services would appear to provide significant assistance in addressing the radiating impact of IPV, one potential barrier pertains to a woman’s access to assistance of counsel in civil cases.” (p. 86)

6. Institute for Policy Integrity, *Supporting Survivors: The Economic Benefits of Providing Civil Legal Assistance to Survivors of Domestic Violence* (July 2015), available at <http://policyintegrity.org/documents/SupportingSurvivors.pdf>

This report assesses the economic benefits of providing civil legal assistance to domestic violence survivors by examining the underlying transaction between an attorney and her client. They find that “civil legal assistance might indeed be cost-benefit justified. Civil legal services improve the likelihood that women will be able to obtain protective orders from courts, which is a significant factor in reducing rates of domestic violence. ... Increased funding to enhance the availability of civil legal services to low-income families can lower the societal costs of domestic violence, generating substantial economic benefits” (p. 1). The Institute for Policy Integrity assesses economic benefits that come with providing legal services to DV survivors and the related costs of such programs. This report received funding from the MacArthur Foundation. The Institute for Policy Integrity is a think tank within NYU Law.

Methodology:

This report presents a comprehensive overview of previous cost-benefit analyses about providing civil legal services to survivors of domestic violence to see if civil legal assistance is cost-benefit justified.

Highlights:

- “The economic status of an individual woman affects her likelihood of being in an abusive relationship. Being poor dramatically increases a woman’s chances of being abused. One analysis of data collected by the Department of Justice’s Bureau of Justice Statistics showed that women in the lowest income households experience seven times the rate of abuse suffered by women in the highest income households. ... Likewise, women who experience food and housing insecurity experience a significantly higher incidence of rape, physical violence, or stalking by an intimate partner” (p. 4).
- When programs and services offer options outside of the abusive relationship, women are more able to leave the abusive relationship: “Economic models of domestic violence predict an inverse relationship between rates of domestic violence and the scope of women’s alternatives outside of their relationships. That is, as battered women’s economic opportunities improve, they are better able to exit violent relationships” (p. 5).
- “83 percent of victims represented by an attorney successfully obtained a protective order, as compared to just 32 percent of victims without an attorney” (p. 7). Another study in Wisconsin found “that the likelihood of receiving a protective order against an abuser jumped from 55 percent to 69 percent when the victim was represented by counsel” (p. 8).
- Using data from the CDC, they write: “Each year, violence perpetrated by intimate partners generates costs in excess of \$9.05 billion” (p. 11). \$6.4 billion of this is due to healthcare costs from assault.
- Legal aid saves states money in terms of: 1) fewer criminal justice interventions, like less 911 calls, the costs of investigators, the costs of feeding, clothing, and housing those incarcerated, and the cost of prosecuting; 2) reducing the costs of social services related to DV like reduced homelessness; and 3) reduction of the externalities imposed on children.

7. Mary A. Kernic, *Final Report of the Impact of Legal Representation on Child Custody Decisions Among Families with a History of Intimate Partner Violence Study*, A report submitted to the Department of Justice (2015), available at <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/248886.pdf>

This study, funded with a grant by the National Institute of Justice, tested whether legal representation of DV victim in child custody decisions leads to greater protections and visitation decisions when compared to those who are not represented. Kernic, a professor at the University of Washington, found that when individuals were represented legal aid attorneys, in comparison to those who did not have legal representation but who qualified for legal aid, the DV victim was 85 percent more likely to have denied visitation to the abusing parent and 77 percent more likely to have restrictions placed on the abusing parent's visitation (if granted at all). This study was funded with a grant by the National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, US Department of Justice.

Methodology:

Kernic conducted a retrospective cohort study among couples who filed for divorce within King County, Washington. She compared those who had a legal aid attorney, privately retained attorney, or no legal representation with nearest neighbor propensity score matching.

Highlights:

- “Attorney representation, particularly representation by legal aid attorneys with expertise in IPV cases, resulted in greater protections being awarded to IPV victims and their children. Improved access of IPV victims to legal representation, particularly by attorneys with expertise in IPV, is indicated” (p. 4).
- Using propensity score matching, the study sample matched 91 cases in which the DV victim had a legal aid attorney and 168 did not have legal representation. The study also matched 524 cases when the DV victim had a private attorney and 538 cases when the DV victim did not have representation.
- “Cases in which the IPV victim parent received legal aid attorney representation were 85% more likely to have visitation denied to the IPV-abusing parent, ... 77% more likely to have restrictions or conditions placed on the IPV-abusing parent's child visitation among the subset of cases in which the IPV-abusing parent was awarded visitation, ... 47% more likely to have treatment or program completion ordered for the IPV-abusing parent, ... and 46% more likely to have sole decision-making awarded to the IPV victim parent relative to unrepresented comparison group cases after adjustment for confounding factor” (p. 41-42).
- “Cases in which the IPV victim parent received private attorney representation were 63% more likely to have supervision of the IPV abusing parent's child visitation ordered by the court and 36% more likely to have treatment or program completion ordered by the court relative to unrepresented comparison group cases after adjustment for confounding factors” (p. 7).

8. Social & Economic Sciences Research Center, Washington State University, *Civil Legal Problems Experienced by Victims of Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault in Washington State: Findings from 2014 Civil Legal Needs Study Update* (2014), available at <http://ocla.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/DV-victims-report-for-OCLA-07-05-2015-Final.pdf>

Moore and Gertseva of the Social and Economic Sciences Research Center at Washington State University conducted a state-wide, address-based probability survey of low-income respondents and a non-probability survey of those who were likely to be underrepresented in the probability survey. They found that of surveyed domestic violence and sexual assault victims, 75 percent of them reported one legal problem and all of them experienced at least one problem in the surveyed problem areas. DV

survivors had an average of 19.69 problems per household, compared to 9.3 problems for general low-income Washingtonians. These legal needs were often familial (custody, divorce, child support). Domestic violence and sexual assault survivors also reported more experiences with discrimination.

Methodology:

They conducted a web, mail and phone state-wide probability survey of low-income residents and augmented this with a non-probability survey of specific groups, which includes domestic violence survivors.

Highlights:

- “Consistent with the findings for the overall respondents, the majority (62%) of victims of domestic violence who got legal help were able to gain some resolution of their legal problem. Seventeen percent (17%) were able to completely resolve their problems with legal help” (p. 3).
- Domestic violence and sexual assault victims “have disproportionately higher levels of legal problems than members of the general low-income population in each category of substantive legal problems including family, health care, consumer-financing, municipal services, rental housing, and employment. The vast majority (81%) were aware of their legal problems and the same percentage were adversely affected by legal problems, including 44% who were severely affected by problems they reported” (p. 7).
- The identified problem areas, after family-related issues, which affected all of the domestic violence and sexual assault victims, “health care (67.6%), consumer-financing (66.7%), municipal services (62%), rental housing (61%), employment (60.4%), and access to government assistance (59.4%)” were the next highest reported problem areas (p. 7).
- “DV/SA victims reported an aggregate total of 3,446 separate legal problems in areas identified in the survey instrument with an average of 19.69 legal problems per household/respondent. This is 2 times higher than an average of 9.3 problems per household/year documented for the general low-income population of Washington” (p. 7)
- “DV/SA victims were almost 2.45 times more likely to be affected by problems associated with child support (23% versus 10%), 4.28 times more likely to have problems related to paternity (12% versus 2.8%), and 5 times more likely to have problems with adoption (16% versus 3%) than the entire low-income population in Washington” (p. 8).

9. Liz Elwart et al., *Increasing Access to Restraining Orders for Low-Income Victims of Domestic Violence: A Cost-Benefit Analysis of the Proposed Domestic Abuse Grant Program*. Prepared for the State Bar Association of Wisconsin (December 2006), available at <http://legalaidresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/Research-Increasing-Access-to-REstraining-Order-for-Low-Income-Victims-of-DV-A-Cost-Benefit-Analysis-of-the-Proposed-Domestic-Abuse-Grant-Program.pdf>

Elwart and colleagues propose expanding the state-sponsored grants available to legal service providers in Wisconsin and recruit more private attorneys to take on pro bono DV cases. They estimate that increasing the Department of Health and Family Services' Domestic Abuse Grant Program by \$1 million would increase the number of victims they could help by 20 percent and improve training for judges, attorneys, and advocates. They conducted a Monte Carlo analysis with 10,000 random trials and extrapolated with this increased \$1 million funding that the net benefit to increasing the state's funding of domestic violence service providers would be \$9.1 million, with minimum benefits at \$800,000 and maximum benefits at \$27.3 million.

Methodology:

They estimated the number of female victims, the percentage of incidents perpetrated by intimate partners, the percent of women in Wisconsin abused by intimate partners, percentage who are low-income, and percentage involving physical or sexual assault. They also used an imputation method to estimate the number of restraining orders sought and observed injunction hearings. A more detailed analysis of the methodology can be found in the appendices.

Highlights:

- “A 2005 report from DAIS [Domestic Abuse Intervention Services in Dane County] indicates that the agency employed just two legal advocates but received over 1,400 requests for legal assistance, forcing many to navigate the restraining order process on their own” (p. 2).
- “In 2003, for example, requests for restraining orders in Dane County were granted approximately 55 percent of the time. With the aid of a legal advocate provided by DAIS, however, that number increased to 69 percent” (p. 2)
- They find that because victims experience difficulty representing themselves and are often unable to or cannot obtain a restraining order against their abuser, they experience increased costs of medical care and productivity loss.
- “Our research indicated that comprehensive services— mental health counseling, counseling for the abuser, and access to a lawyer for custody or divorce hearings—are imperative to reversing the damage of domestic violence. Although provision of these services would certainly be more costly, they would likely increase the effectiveness of restraining order” (p. 20).

10. Nicole E. Allen et al., *Battered Women’s Multitude of Needs: Evidence Supporting the Need for Comprehensive Advocacy*, 10 *Violence Against Women* 1015 (2004), available at <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801204267658>

Allen and colleagues conducted a cluster analysis and found that DV victims present three groups of needs: those related to housing, education and employment, and legal issues. They found that of those leaving a domestic violence shelter, 59 percent reported unmet legal needs. This research was funded by a grant from the National Center for Injury Prevention and Control of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. The authors are psychologists and teach at the university level.

Methodology:

They interviewed participants within the first week of leaving a shelter program. After the first interview, some of those involved were randomly selected to work with an advocate. They compared the effect of the advocacy intervention between those who received the service and those who did not.

Highlights:

- “For women who had children, 67% indicated they needed to address child care issues, and 68% indicated they wanted to address other issues related to their children” (p. 1023).
- When rated on a scale of need, the need for legal assistance was the second highest, only after the need for material goods (p. 1024).
- The need for legal assistance often overlapped with other needs, such as child care. “For example, one subgroup of women was particularly focused on legal assistance, however these women were also engaged in activities to address housing needs and child-related issues. Similarly, women in the education/employment group also indicated they were working on financial and health care issues. It appears, then, that even when women had extremely pressing needs in one domain of their lives (e.g., legal, housing), they were likely to be” (p. 1029).
- The study shows that legal issues overlap with other legal needs: “Most all battered women focus on legal services or criminal justice intervention. Of the sample, 59% noted working on legal

issues, and for at least some of these women, the legal problem was not directly related to the prosecution of the assailant or to obtaining a protection order. Rather, women were fighting landlords, getting divorced, working out custody and visitation, or dealing with other legal concerns” (p. 1030).

11. Amy Farmer & Jill Tiefenthaler, *Explaining the Recent Decline in Domestic Violence*, 21 *Contemporary Economic Policy* 158 (2003), available at <https://doi.org/10.1093/cep/byg002>

Domestic violence decreased in the 1990s. Using survey data from the National Crime Victimization Survey and the Federal Information Processing Standard codes to individualize the data, they identify three factors for the decrease of domestic violence in the 1990s: “(1) the increased provision of legal services for victims of intimate partner abuse, (2) improvements in women’s economic status, and (3) demographic trends, most notably the aging of the population” (p. 158). Both authors are economists.

Methodology:

They used data from the Area-Identified National Crime Victimization Survey between 1992-98 and used the National Directory of Domestic Violence Programs to create a spreadsheet of the existence and number of programs providing services in each county. They used these data sets to examine the determinants of those who report abuse.

Highlights:

- “Because legal services help women with practical matters (such as protective orders, custody, and child support) they appear to actually present women with real, long-term alternatives to their relationships” (p. 164).
- “Women living in counties with shelters, hot-lines, safe homes, emergency transportation, programs for batterers, children’s programs, and counseling are not significantly less likely to be victims of intimate partner abuse than women who live in counties without these services. However, women who live in counties with legal assistance programs to help battered women are significantly less likely to report abuse” (p. 164).
- “For legal services to contribute to the decline in domestic violence in 1990s, the provision of legal services for battered women must have increased over this time period. According to the 1986 National Directory of Domestic Violence Programs, in 1986 there were 336 legal services programs serving victims of domestic violence. By 1994, the number increased to 1190 programs nation-wide, an increase of 254%! Between 1994 and 2000, the number of legal programs for battered women increased to 1441 programs” (p. 167).

12. Ronet Bachman, Heather Zaykowski, Rachel Kallmyer, Margarita Poteyeva, Christina Lanier Joseph H. Stauss et al., (2008) *Violence Against American Indian and Alaska Native Women and the Criminal Justice Response: What is Known*, available at <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/223691.pdf>

This study, funded by the National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, and U.S. Department of Justice, summarizes the epidemiology of violence against American Indian and Alaska Native women and the criminal justice response to violence. It reviews several datasets and surveys to identify key issues and barriers related to assault, dating violence, stalking and other forms of victimization among AI/AN women. The study also highlights the prevalence and potential effectiveness of grants and federal programs (such as the STOP VAIW Program) that can help survivors navigate complex civil and criminal justice systems.

Methodology: The study employed data from the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), police reports, the National Violence Against Women survey and other national and local studies to summarize various forms of violence against AI/AN women.

Highlights:

- “An analysis of the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) reveals that rates of rape and other sexual assaults are higher for American Indian and Alaska Native women compared to both African American and white women. Rape and sexual assaults against all women regardless of race were more likely to be committed known offenders.” (p. 6)
- “National annual incidence rates and lifetime prevalence rates for physical assaults are also higher for American Indian and Alaska Native women compared to other women.” (p. 6)
- “Although tribal governments do not have jurisdiction to prosecute non-American Indian and Alaska Native offenders in criminal courts, they do have authority to enact civil orders against them, including Personal Protection Orders (PPOs). PPOs provide injunctive relief for petitioners who seek to use legal remedies to end threatening behavior, cease contact with another individual, or to alter custody arrangements.” (p. 9)
- “...[T]he variety of orders and accompanying legal punishments and the understanding of the intent of the order vary by each State and tribal government, creating significant barriers to the enforcement of ‘Full Faith and Credit.’” (p. 9)
- “One of the most significant and long-running initiatives administered specifically for American Indian and Alaska Native communities has been the Services-Training-Officers-Prosecutors (STOP) Violence Against Indian Women (VAIW) program.” (p. 134)
- “American Indian and Alaska Native tribal governments and tribal associations may also apply for funding under the Legal Assistance for Victims Grant Program. This initiative is designed to improve civil and criminal legal assistance for victims of domestic and dating violence, as well as sexual assault and stalking.” (p. 136)

EXPLAINING THE RECENT DECLINE IN DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

AMY FARMER and JILL TIEFENTHALER*

Abstract

According to the Department of Justice, the incidence of domestic violence decreased during the 1990s. Understanding the causes of this decline could offer important insight into designing effective policies to continue this trend. In this paper, we use the Area Identified National Crime Victimization Surveys (NCVS), the same data used to generate the DOJ's national estimates, merged with county-level variables, to examine the determinants of women reporting abuse. Our results indicate that there are three important factors that likely contribute to the decline: (1) the increased provision of legal services for victims of intimate partner abuse, (2) improvements in women's economic status, and (3) demographic trends, most notably the aging of the population.

I. INTRODUCTION

Domestic violence is a serious problem in our society with significant social costs. Despite the tremendous toll on both the victims and society, domestic violence was not recognized as a public health issue in the US until relatively recently. With the women's movement of the 1970s, domestic violence was increasingly recognized as a public, not a private, issue. The result has been growing public and private initiatives to eradicate domestic violence.

After more than 20 years of effort, the rate of domestic violence appears to be declining. According to a recent report published by the Department of Justice [2000], violence against women by intimate partners fell by 21 percent between 1993 and 1998 from 1.1 million violent incidents to 876,340 incidents¹.

What factors explain this recent decline? Economic models of domestic violence predict that violence against women will decline as women's alternatives outside their relationships improve. (See Tauchen et al. [1991] and Farmer and Tiefenthaler [1997] which is further discussed in Section 2.) One way to improve battered women's alternatives is by providing shelters, hotlines, and other services that help make leaving their relationships realistic for these women. Federal, state, and local governments as well as numerous nonprofit groups have contributed to increasing the availability of services for battered women throughout the country over the past 25 years.

While programs that provide services to battered women such as shelters may provide women with short-term alternatives to staying with their abusers, improving women's economic status (for example, by increasing educational attainment) will result in more battered women being able to achieve self-sufficiency in the long-run. If battered women can support themselves, they are both more likely to leave and have more power within their relationships if they stay. As a result, economic equality for women – both at the individual- and community-level - is also predicted to lower the incidence of domestic violence.

Do better alternatives for women explain the decline in domestic violence in the 1990s? Have both improved economic status and more service provision provided women with better alternatives to abusive relationships and, therefore, lowered the incidence of intimate partner abuse? In this paper, we use the Area-Identified National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) (see Section 3 for more discussion of the data set), made available to us through a grant from the National Consortium for Violence Research in cooperation with the US Census Bureau, to examine the determinants of the incidence of intimate partner abuse. The NCVS are the same

data used by the Department of Justice to construct their annual estimates of victimization. Because the Area-Identified NCVS include detailed geographical identifiers, we are able to investigate the effects of county-level variables, including the existence of programs for battered women, welfare payments, and women's overall economic status on the incidence of abuse at the individual-level. By examining the determinants of intimate partner abuse at the individual-level, we can provide some insight into which factors explain the decline in the incidence of domestic violence nationally.

Using a probit analysis, we examine the determinants of an individual woman reporting abuse (see Section 4). The findings generate three important factors that are likely to have contributed to the decline in violence against women in the 90s. First, while shelters, hotlines, and counseling programs targeted at battered women are found to have no significant impact on the likelihood of domestic abuse, the availability of legal services in the county of residence has a significant, negative effect on the likelihood that an individual woman is battered. Given that the provision of legal services for victims of domestic violence has increased dramatically in the 90s, we conclude that legal services provision is one likely significant factor in explaining the decline. Both the improvement in women's economic status and demographic changes in the population may have also contributed to explaining the decreased incidence of intimate partner abuse. Our analysis indicates that increased education, for both battered women themselves and for women in general, significantly lowers the rate of abuse. Given that women's educational attainment continued to increase in the 1990s, this variable appears to contribute to the decline. Some of the decline in the rate of domestic violence also may be the result of demographic trends. Our population is aging and older women are significantly less likely to be victims of this type of abuse.

II. BACKGROUND

In a recent press release (May 17, 2000), the Justice Department's Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) reports that violence against women by intimate partners fell by 21 percent from 1993 through 1998. This statistic was calculated from the National Crime Victimization Surveys (NCVS); an annual survey on the incidence of all types of crimes including violence by intimates (current or former spouses, girlfriends, or boyfriends). National estimates on the rate of domestic violence are only available from 1993 because the NCVS (formerly called the National Crime Survey (NCS)) was significantly redesigned in 1992. Previous estimates of intimate partner abuse were found to suffer from a serious problem of underreporting, but the redesigned survey includes several questions concerning specifically intimate partner abuse. However, trend data are available on intimate partner homicide since the 1970s and these data support a long-term decline in domestic violence. The BJS reports that between 1976 and 1998, the number of male victims of intimate partner homicide fell an average 4% per year and the number of female victims fell an average 1% per year.

In addition to documenting the decline in the rate of domestic abuse, the BJS report by Rennison and Welchans [2000] outlines the characteristics of the victims. Data from the NCVS indicate that being young, black, poor, and divorced or separated all increase to the likelihood of a woman being a victim of intimate partner abuse. Specifically, women ages 20-24 are the most likely to be victimized while black women are 35% more likely to be abused than white women and 2.5 times more likely than women of other races. Women in the lowest income households have 7 times the abuse rates of those in the highest income households. Finally, women with children under 12 experience twice the rate of abuse than those without young children.

What factors explain the apparent decline in intimate partner abuse? Economic theory predicts that the incidence of abuse declines as women gain economic independence and therefore gain power in their relationships. Farmer and Tiefenthaler [1997] show that as

women's alternatives to their relationships improve, they should experience less violence because as women gain credible threats to exit their relationships, they can assert more power within the relationships. Men are forced to lessen the violence or risk losing their partners. Consequently, women are more likely to leave, or they suffer less violence if they choose to stay. Given this theory, we expect that as women's outside alternatives improve, intimate partner abuse should decline. This could occur due to improvements in individual women's economic status. Women who have greater earnings or earning potential are more likely to leave abusive relationships because they can support themselves. If men respond to women's increased power by lowering the violence, women may decide to stay but, clearly, the incidence of violence has declined and the women are better off. In addition, overall gender equality in the community might provide battered women with better alternatives and, therefore, more credible threats of leaving. For example, a woman's threat to leave her abuser is much more credible if she lives in an area where a large percentage of women are employed and women's wages are high. Finally, outside options could also be improved via services provided to help battered women such as shelters, welfare benefits, and civil legal services to assist women with protection orders, child support, and custody.

Farmer and Tiefenthaler [1997] find support for the theory as women who with the highest personal incomes (this includes both wages and non-wage income such as child support and public assistance) experience the least amount of abuse. The BJS finding that poor, young, minority women with young children are most likely to be victims of intimate partner abuse is also consistent with the theory given that these women have the fewest alternatives to their relationships. Other studies support the notion that women's alternatives affect the level of violence that they experiences. Gelles [1976] and Pagelow [1981] both find evidence that women with access to fewer resources are less likely to leave their abusers. Kalmuss and Straus [1990] indicate that women who are highly dependent on marriage suffer greater abuse while several studies (see, for example, Coleman and Straus [1986] and Allen and Straus [1980]) find that

women in male-dominated marriages experience more violence. Finally, overall gender inequality has been linked to higher rates of abuse across states and countries.²

Although the empirical literature supports the importance of women's economic alternatives as a determinant of domestic violence, there is little empirical work that examines the effect of service provision on the rate of female abuse. However, one study does examine the effect of service provision on the rate at which women kill their husbands. Dugan et al. [1998] examines the effects of domesticity, women's economic power, and resources for battered women on intimate partner homicides in 29 US cities over four biannual periods. The results indicate that both women's economic power and services provided for battered women lower the rate at which women kill their husbands. The authors contend that women with better alternatives are more likely to use them rather than resort to killing their abusers to protect themselves.

III. DATA

The US Census Bureau on behalf of the Bureau of Justice Statistics undertakes the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) annually. The primary goal of the NCVS is to collect detailed crime data for calculation of national estimates of crime rates by both the type of crime and for various sub-populations. In addition to detailed information on each incident of crime reported, the data include basic demographic information, such as gender, race, education, age, and income. The NCVS sample is made up of about 50,000 housing units selected with a stratified, multi-stage clustering design. The sample design results in individuals living in large, metropolitan areas being over-represented in the sample. The NCVS, previously called the National Crime Survey (NCS), was significantly redesigned in 1992. Consequently, NCS data prior to 1992 are not compatible with the 1992-1998 surveys. One of the main purposes of the 1992 redesign was to generate more accurate data on the incidence of domestic violence by adding several probing questions about acts of violence committed by known and intimate

offenders. The newer design increased the rates at which victims reported domestic violence and, consequently, provides more accurate estimates of the rate of intimate partner violence.

While the public use NCVS (ICPSR 6406) do not include geographical identifiers, through a grant from the National Consortium for Violence Research (NCOVR) in cooperation with the Census Bureau and the Bureau of Justice Statistics, we were granted access to the Area-Identified NCVS data. The Area-Identified NCVS has standard geographical area identifiers for all housing units sampled including, most importantly for our purposes, county identifiers. The county identifiers allowed us to merge community-level variables with each individual's data.

The final sample used for our analysis is 525,615 observations on women ages 18 and over from the 1992-1998 NCVS. It is important to note that the NCVS is a panel, interviewing the same households over several time periods, and, as a result, the data set does not represent 525,615 different women. We identified the women who were victims of intimate partner abuse using the Department of Justice's definition - a victim of violent crime (including rape, sexual assault, robbery, aggravated assault, and simple assault) committed by a current or former spouse, or boyfriend. Women who had experienced such an incident in the past six months (the NCVS takes incident reports on all crimes within the last six months) were categorized as "battered women." Our final sample includes 1863 observations on battered women³. Table 1 compares the characteristics of these women with the characteristics of the other women in the sample.

TABLE 1 (Attached at the end of the report)

The descriptive statistics are consistent with those reported by the DOJ [2000]. Women who are victims of domestic violence are, on average, younger, have more children, and are more likely to be employed than other women. Black women, women with little formal education, and women who live in households with relatively low incomes are over-represented in the sample of battered women. Most strikingly, divorced and separated women are much more likely to report being abused than are married women. Fifty-one percent of the sample of battered women are divorced or separated compared with only 13% of the other women.

However, this difference could simply reflect that divorced or separated women are more likely to be willing to report abuse than are married women.

In order to examine the effects of community variables on the incidence of domestic violence, we used the state and county FIPS codes in the Area-Identified NCVS to merge county-level variables to the individual-level data. We chose the county as our unit of analysis because all of the households in the NCVS have county identifiers (not the case for some of the smaller area identifiers). The county variables that we are interested in are proxies for the economic alternatives and status of women in the community. Services for battered women may present battered women with improved options outside the relationship. Consequently, we used the 1994 *National Directory of Domestic Violence Programs* to create a county spreadsheet of the existence and number of programs providing services to help battered women in each county⁴. We supplemented the information in the *Directory* by calling those programs that were listed in the directory but did not provide information on the types of services provided. We used the Directory and supplemental information to create variables for the types of services offered by the programs including hotlines, shelters (including the number of beds), safe homes, counseling, emergency transport, rape counseling, programs for victims' children, programs for batterers, and legal services. Research indicates that battered women often rely on welfare payments as a means of escaping abusive relationships⁵. Therefore, we also merge the state-level average welfare payment (taken from selected *Statistical Abstracts*) to the individual-level data.

While a woman's own education and employment status are likely to have the strongest impact on her economic status outside the relationship, the economic status of women in the community in which she lives may also improve her options. Women who live in areas where women are well represented in the labor force and relatively educated are likely to have more credible threats of leaving abusive relationships. Therefore, the percent of women in the labor force and the percent of women with college degrees divided by the percent of men with college degrees are also merged with the individual-level data. The population of the county is also

included as women who live in more urban areas are likely to have more options. All of these county variables are taken from selected editions of the *County and City Data Book*. Table 2 presents some selected statistics on the county variables.

TABLE 2 (Attached at the end of the report)

While a minority of counties has services for battered women, the majority of women live in counties where such services are available. For example, only 35% of US counties have a shelter for battered women yet 82% of American women live in counties with at least one shelter. Some services are much more likely to be available than others are. Counseling, hotlines, and shelters are the most widely available services while safe homes and rape counseling are available to fewer than half of all women.

One could argue that the costs of committing abuse are also an important determinant of the incidence of domestic violence and, therefore, any changes in these costs could explain the decline in domestic violence in the 1990s. If this is the case, the costs, or legal punishments, should also be included in the analysis. We do not include these costs here for two reasons. First, most changes in the legal environment occurred in the 1980s, and there has been no significant shift during the time period of our data. In fact, between 1984 and 1989, arrest rates rose 70% for minor assaults, indicating that police were increasing their interventions significantly before the 1990s. 1984 represented a significant year for law enforcement reform after the Minneapolis Domestic Violence Experiment indicated that arrest served as a deterrent for future abuse. Sweeping reform followed this research and the recommendations of the 1984 Attorney General's Task Force on Domestic Violence (see Schmidt and Sherman [1993]). No such major initiatives occurred during the period under investigation in this paper. Secondly, since the 1984 research, a large number of studies have questioned the effectiveness of arrest as a deterrent. (See Buzawa and Buzawa [1996] for a survey.) In particular, Schmidt and Sherman [1993] criticize Sherman's original work on the Minneapolis experiment, representing a major reversal of his findings concerning the efficacy of arrest as a deterrent. Other recent studies

including Gelles [1996] and Hirschel and Hutchison [1996] cast doubt on the role of punishment in deterring domestic abuse.

IV. RESULTS

In order to examine the causes of the decline in domestic violence in the 1990s, we first examine the determinants of a woman reporting to be a victim of abuse. Variables that significantly lower (increase) the incidence of domestic violence that are also trending upward (downward) can be identified as contributing factors to the decline in the rate of domestic violence nationally. In Section IV.A, we identify the variables that significantly impact the likelihood of a woman reporting domestic abuse. In Section IV.B, we examine whether or not the significant variables are trending in the right direction in terms of contributing to the decline in the incidence of domestic violence.

A. The Determinants of Domestic Violence

Table 3 summarizes the results from a probit estimation of the determinants of a woman reporting to be a victim of intimate partner abuse⁶. Whether or not each variable is a significant determinant of the incidence of domestic violence (at 95% confidence) is reported in the Table. For the significant variables, whether or not the variable has a positive or negative effect on abuse is also reported. The full results from the probit estimation are presented in the Appendix⁷.

TABLE 3 (Attached at the end of the Report)

As the results indicate, most of the service variables are not significant factors in explaining the incidence of domestic abuse in the NCVS data. With the exception of legal services, none of the services specifically designed to help victims of domestic violence impact the likelihood of abuse. Women living in counties with shelters, hotlines, safe homes, emergency transportation, programs for batterers, children's programs, and counseling are not significantly less likely to be victims of intimate partner abuse than women who live in counties without these

services⁸. However, women who live in counties with legal assistance programs to help battered women are significantly less likely to report abuse. Because legal services help women with practical matters such as protective orders, custody, and child support they appear to actually present women with real, long-term alternatives to their relationships. Our results reject the Department of Justice [2000] claim that an increase in services provided for battered women is the major explanation for the recent decline in the reported incidence of domestic violence.

Women's economic status is also found to be a significant predictor of the likelihood of abuse. The gender education ratio (% of women with college degrees/% of men with college degrees) has a negative and significant effect on the likelihood that a woman reports that she is a victim of intimate partner abuse. It is interesting to note that when we entered both the percentage of women and men holding college degrees as regressors instead of the education ratio, women's educational attainment had a significant and negative effect on domestic violence while the men's variable significantly increased the incidence of abuse. Economic status at the individual-level also matters. More educated women and women who live in high-income households are less likely to be victims of abuse.

The results on some of the other individual level variables offer additional policy implications and insight into the dynamics of spousal abuse. Several of the results support the descriptive statistics on domestic violence presented by the BJS. Younger women, women with young children, and women who live in low-income household are more likely to be victims of intimate partner abuse. However, while the incidence of domestic violence is higher among black women, once you control for marital status, black women, like other minority women, are less likely to be abused than are non-Hispanic white women. The negative effect of being married on abuse is likely both the result of selection (if a woman is abused, the relationship is less likely to be intact) and reporting (women are more likely to report abuse if they are not living with the abuser).

The most surprising result we find is that the generosity of welfare in the state of residence actually had a significant and positive effect on the likelihood of abuse. There are several possible explanations for this counterintuitive result. One explanation is that women who leave abusive relationships may migrate to states that are more generous with welfare. As summarized in a US General Accounting Office [1998] report, studies indicate that a significant proportion of women on welfare, between 55 and 65 percent, report having been abused by an intimate partner in the past. In addition, Blank [1988], Enchautegui [1997], and Borjas [1999] all find that the poor do tend to migrate to states that offer more generous welfare payments. Another explanation is that states with greater incidences of domestic violence have responded with increasing welfare payments. However, it should be noted that dropping the state welfare payment from the regression does not significantly alter the coefficients on the remaining variables. Therefore, endogeneity does not appear to be a significant problem. Finally, state welfare generosity is the only state-level variable included in the regression. Therefore, the positive relationship between welfare payments and the likelihood of abuse may result because some important state-level determinants of the incidence of domestic violence are omitted from the regression. Whatever the explanation for this result, it is clear that more work needs to be done on the relationship between welfare and domestic abuse. The high rate of victimization among women on welfare indicates that welfare is used as an escape route for many battered women. Clearly, our approach of simply including the variance in generosity across states as an indicator of abuse in a wider analysis of the effects of community-level variables is missing part of the story.

The results also show regional variation in the incidence of domestic violence. Relative to women living in New England (as well as the Middle Atlantic, South Atlantic, and West North Central), those who live in the East North Central, East South Central, West South Central, Mountain, and Pacific regions of the country are more likely to report abuse. These results likely reflect differences in attitudes and values across regions as well as any systematic

regional variation in programs that offer economic alternatives to battered women not included as regressors.

The time trend variable is not a significant predictor of the likelihood of abuse once the control variables discussed above are added as regressors. This result suggests that it is changes in the individual and community-level variables over time that is generating the decline in the incidence of domestic violence in the US and that the important variables for explaining this decline are included in our analysis. The following section examines the national trends in these significant variables.

B. Trends in the Significant Variables

The best way to examine the causes of the reported decline in domestic violence over time in the US would be to use time series data on the incidence of domestic violence in the US. However, as discussed in Section III, the NCVS was redesigned in 1992 in order to improve reporting of domestic violence. Consequently, data prior to this time is not reliable and, therefore, a significant time series of estimates of the rate of domestic violence in the US does not exist. We attempt to estimate the determinants of the reported decline by using a panel data set at the individual-level to first isolate the important determinants of the incidence of domestic violence and then to examine whether or not these significant variables are trending in the right direction to possibly contribute to the decline in the rate over time. While we cannot say that the variables that are both significant determinants of the incidence of domestic violence at the individual-level and trending in the right direction nationally are definitively the causes of the trend downward in the rate of domestic violence, they are likely suspects.

While most services provided to help battered women do not impact the likelihood of abuse, the provision of legal services significantly lowers the incidence of domestic violence. However, for legal services to contribute to the decline in domestic violence in 1990s, the provision of legal services for battered women must have increased over this time period.

According to the 1986 *National Directory of Domestic Violence Programs*, in 1986 there were 336 legal services programs serving victims of domestic violence. By 1994, the number increased to 1190 programs nationwide, an increase of 254%! Between 1994 and 2000, the number of legal programs for battered women increased to 1441 programs. Clearly, the expansion of legal assistance to battered women has accounted for part of the decline in the incidence of domestic violence nationwide. The expansion of legal services has mostly resulted from existing programs for victims of intimate partner abuse adding legal services to their lists of services provided as opposed to new programs opening their doors. Part of the credit for the expansion of legal services goes to the federal government. With the passage of the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) in 1994, the federal government made a commitment to meet the needs of women who are victims of violence. One grant program set up to respond to the legal needs of women who are victims of intimate partner violence is the Domestic Violence Victims' Civil Legal Assistance Program. Since 1998, this program has provided more than \$60 million to more than 200 non-profit, non-governmental organizations to provide civil legal services to victims of domestic violence.

Another important determinant of the likelihood of a woman reporting abuse is education. Both the woman's own educational status (having a college degree) and the relative education of women in her community (the % of women in the county with college degrees relative to the % of men in the county with college degrees) significantly impact the likelihood of abuse. From 1993 to 1998, the percentage of women nationwide with college degrees increased from 17.9% to 20.7%, an increase of almost 16%. The increase was even more significant for black women increasing from 10.9% to 13.6%, representing more than a 35% increase in the proportion of college-educated black women. The increase in women's educational attainment over the time period is likely to play a substantial role in diminishing the incidence of domestic abuse.

Household income is also found to be a significant predictor of the likelihood that the woman is a victim of domestic violence. Household income is likely to be significant both because women are more likely to have earnings and, therefore, economic power, in households with higher incomes and because as men's incomes (and education status) increase, they are less likely to abuse their partners (see Farmer and Tiefenthaler [2000]). The suggestion that women's economic power is, at least, partially the explanation for the negative relationship between household income and domestic violence is supported by the fact that when household income is dropped from the list of independent variables, women's employment status has a significant and negative effect on the likelihood of abuse.

According to Census statistics, over the period from 1993 to 1998, both median household income and women's median income increased. Median household income in 1993 (1998 adjusted dollars) was \$35,241. By 1998 that figure has risen to \$38,885, an increase of 10.3%. The economic prosperity of the 90s has been cited as a likely cause of the decrease in the overall crime rate in the 90s and it appears to have been a cause of the decrease in domestic violence as well. Women's median income increased almost 18% from \$13,800 to \$16,258 (1998 adjusted dollars). Not only did women's real income rise, indicating an increase in outside options, but women's income as a percentage of men's income rose over this period as well. In 1993 women's median income was 49.7% of men's while in 1998 that figure had increased to 53.0%. An increase in women's earning power relative to men's implies that women have both more opportunities for self-sufficiency and fewer gains from marriage. Both of these factors will increase the likelihood that women leave abusive relationships. Finally, women's labor force participation rate rose 2 percentage points from 58.5% in 1993 to 60.5% in 1998.

One of the most important demographic trends of the 21st century will be the increasing age of the populations in developed countries. This demographic trend, which started in the late 20th century, appears to have an important impact on the incidence of domestic violence. Younger women experience significantly more violence with women between the ages

of 20 and 24 most likely to be victims. During the 1990s, the percentage of women in this age category fell from 35.8% in 1993 to 32.0% in 1998. This decline of 3.8 percentage points represents a 10.6% decline in the percentage of the U.S. population that belongs to the highest risk age group. As the population continues to age, the incidence of domestic violence will continue to decline.

Race is also a significant factor in the reported incidence of abuse and the changing racial composition of our population, another important demographic trend that will continue in the 21st century, appears to be another significant factor in explaining the decline in domestic violence. Although the BJS report suggests that black women are more likely to be abuse victims, once other factors such as income and marital status are controlled for, we find that black women are less likely to be abused than their non-Hispanic white counterparts. Similarly, we find that Hispanic women as well as women of all other races are less likely to be victims than non-Hispanic white women. The percentage of the female population that is white non-Hispanic fell 1.2 percentage points from 38.1% to 36.9% between 1993 and 1998. This decline represents a significant demographic shift over such a short period of time. Holding other factors constant, as our population continues to become more racially diverse, the reported incidence of domestic violence should continue to decline. However, if the increase in racial diversity is the result of increased immigration and, therefore, is accompanied by lower educational status among women (and men) and more poor households, we are not likely to see a decline in intimate partner abuse.

The number of children that a woman has is also a significant determinant of abuse. Women with children, especially young children, are more dependent on their relationships and have fewer alternatives for self-sufficiency outside their relationships and, consequently, are more likely to be abused. Although the fertility rate declined dramatically in previous decades, there was no significant change in this variable in the 90s and, therefore, it is not a significant factor in explaining the decline in domestic violence.

The regression results indicate that married women are less likely to report being abused. During the period from 1993 to 1998, the percentage of married women fell from 56.5% to 54.9%, representing a 1.6 percentage point drop. As a result, we expect that the increase in the percentages of divorced and separated women would increase the rate of reported intimate partner abuse. Clearly, any positive effect of the increase in divorce on domestic violence is outweighed by trends in other more important variables.

In addition to individual characteristics, we find that some community variables matter as well. Geographic location, possibly indicative of cultural norms and attitudes, is a significant predictor of the likelihood of abuse. Specifically, women living in the East North Central, East South Central, West South Central, Mountain, and Pacific regions report more abuse than women living in New England, the Middle and South Atlantic, and the West North Central regions of the country. The states with the greatest population increases over in the 1990s are in the Pacific, Mountain and South Atlantic regions. While women living in the Pacific and Mountain regions experience significantly more violence, those living in the South Atlantic do not. However, given the magnitude of the population increases in the Pacific and Mountain regions relative to the rest of the US (8 of 10 states with the greatest population growth are in these two regions), this variable does not generally support the trend to lower rates of abuse and may, in fact, be working in the opposite direction.

Finally, we find that as welfare payments rise so does abuse. Given that the 1996 welfare reform has decreased the overall generosity of most states' welfare programs, this result is consistent with a lower national rate of abuse. However, the positive relationship between abuse and welfare generosity is a curious result with no theoretical basis. It may be explained by women leaving abusive relationships migrate to states that offer more generous support. In any case, we should be very careful in citing decreased welfare generosity as a source of the national decline in domestic violence.

Our analysis indicates that more widespread provision of legal services for battered women, improved educational and economic status for women, and demographic trends explain the decline in domestic violence in the 1990s. With the exception of migration to the Mountain and Pacific regions of the country, a slight decline in marriage rates, and the fact that the average number of children has remained constant in the 90s, every significant variable in our regression is trending in a direction that predicts a lower rate of abuse.

The psuedo- R^2 from the estimation of the full model indicates that the right-hand-side variables explain only 14% of the variation in the dependent variable, the probability of an individual woman being a victim of domestic violence. Certainly many other important variables, such as the abuser's and the victim's family backgrounds, have been omitted (this information is not included in the NCVS). However, these variables are likely to be more important in explaining why some women are abused and others are not at a point in time than in explaining the decline in domestic violence over time. As previously discussed, the incidence of domestic violence declined by 21% between 1993 and 1998 from 1.1 million violent incidents to 876,340 incidents. Therefore, the probability of an individual woman being abused fell from 0.011% to 0.0084%, a decline in the likelihood of being abused of 0.0026%. Using the partial derivatives from the full model (presented in the Appendix) and the change in the average national statistics for the dependent variables in 1993 and 1998⁹, the key variables – the improvement in women's educational and economic status, the increase in the number of legal programs, and the aging of the population – explain approximately 22% of the decline (almost 50,000 incidents) in domestic violence over this time period. Clearly, future work that includes time series analysis would produce more accurate estimates. However, these results suggest that past trends that are likely to continue into the 21st century will have a significant impact on the incidence of domestic violence in the US in the future.

V. CONCLUSION

The goal of this paper is to ascertain the source of the decline in intimate partner abuse from 1993 to 1998 cited in a recent report by the Bureau of Justice Statistics. We find three significant factors in explaining the decline: (1) the increased provision of legal services for victims of intimate partner abuse, (2) improved educational and economic status for women, and (3) demographic trends including the aging of the population and an increase in racial diversity. Specifically, US women have become older, more educated, richer, and more likely to belong to a minority race. In addition, the provision of legal services has exploded in the past decade. All of these factors are significant determinants of abuse and are trending in the right direction to explain the reduced incidence of domestic violence in the US.

Our results have important policy implications given that factors that explain the decline in domestic violence in the 90s are likely to be key variables in continuing to lower abuse in decades to come. First, the availability of legal services has a significant negative effect on the incidence of abuse. The VAWA has been an important impetus for funding in the area of civil legal assistance. The continued expansion of the availability of civil legal services will likely continue to lower the incidence of intimate partner abuse in the future. While other services – hotlines, shelters, job training, outreach, and counseling – are not significantly related to women’s reports of domestic violence in the NCVS, given their use, these services are clearly valuable to battered women. However, expansion of these services should focus on providing what clients need to become self-sufficient. While short-term housing and counseling provide women with important temporary safety and support (and, therefore, may significantly reduce the incidence of serious injuries resulting from domestic violence), they are more likely to lower the overall incidence of domestic violence if they provide women with long-term, realistic alternatives to their relationships. Increased funding is necessary in order to provide these types of services.

Women's educational attainment, a key indicator of economic status, is an important determinant of the likelihood of abuse. We find that a woman's own formal schooling (a college degree) and the educational attainment of women in her community lower the likelihood that she reports abuse. Therefore, continuing the trend of improving women's education will likely be a key factor in eliminating domestic violence. Many women have gained access to higher education through community colleges and part-time college enrollment. Funding to subsidize community colleges and policies that make it easier for women to enroll in college (for example, subsidized day care for students) would likely generate many positive outcomes for society, including a lower incidence of domestic violence. Women's employment and earnings are also important in providing them with alternatives to their abusive relationships. Therefore, policies to eliminate the wage gap would also likely have the desired impact on the incidence of violence against women.

VII. REFERENCES

- Allen, C. and M.A. Straus. "Resources, Power and Husband-Wife Violence", in *The Social Causes of Husband-Wife Violence*, edited by M.A. Straus and G.T. Hotaling. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1980.
- Blank, R.M. "The Effect of Welfare and Wage Levels on the Location Decisions of Female-Headed Households." *Journal of Urban Economics*, 24, 1988, 186-211.
- Borjas, G.J. "Immigration and Welfare Magnets." *Journal of Labor Economics*, 17(4), 1999, 607-637.
- Buzawa, E. and C. Buzawa. *Do Arrests and Restraining Orders Work?* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1996.
- Coleman, D.H. and M.A. Straus. "Marital Power, Conflict and Violence in a Nationally Representative Sample of American Couples." *Violence and Victims*, 1986, 141-157.
- Dugan, L., D. Nagin, and R. Rosenfeld. "Explaining the Decline in Intimate Partner Homicide: The Effects of Changing Domesticity, Women's Status, and Domestic Violence Resources." Working Paper, National Consortium on Violence Research, 1998.
- Enchautegui, M.E. "Welfare Payments and Other Determinants of Female Migration." *Journal of Labor Economics* 15, 1997, 529-554.
- Farmer, A. and J. Tiefenthaler. "The Employment Effects of Domestic Violence." Colgate University Working Paper 100-04, 2000.
- , "An Economic Analysis of Domestic Violence." *Review of Social Economy* LV(3), 1997, 337-358.
- Gelles, J. "Abused Wives: Why Do They Stay?" *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 38, 1976, 659-668.

- Hirschel, D. and I. Hutchison. "Realities and Implications of the Charlotte Spousal Abuse Experiment" in *Do Arrests and Restraining Orders Work?* edited by E. Buzawa and C. Buzawa. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1996.
- Kalmuss, D. and M. Straus. "Wife's Marital Dependency and Wife Abuse," in *Physical Violence in American Families*, edited by M.A. Straus and R.J. Gelles. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1990.
- Levinson, D. *Family Violence in Cross-Cultural Perspective*. Newbury Park: CA: Sage Publications, 1989.
- Pagelow, M.D. *Woman-battering: Victims and Their Experiences*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1981.
- Rennison, C.M. and S. Welchans. "Intimate Partner Violence," *Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report*, May 2000, NCV 178247.
- Schmidt, J. and L. Sherman. "Does Arrest Deter Domestic Violence?" *American Behavioral Scientist*, 36(5), 1993, 601-609.
- Straus, M.A. "State-to-State Differences in Social Inequality and Social Bonds in Relation to Assaults on Wives in the United States." *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 25(1), 1994, 7-24.
- "The National Family Violence Surveys," in *Physical Violence in American Families*, edited by M.A. Straus and R.J. Gelles. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1990.
- Tauchen, H.V., A.D. Witte, and S.K. Long. "Domestic Violence: A Nonrandom Affair," *International Economic Review*, 32(2), 1991, 491-511.
- Tjaden, P. and N. Thoennes "Prevalence, Incidence, and Consequences of Violence Against Women: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey." *Research in Brief*, Washington DC: US Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, 1998, NCJ 172837.

U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. "Intimate Partner Violence Against Women Declined From 1993 Through 1998." *Bureau of Justice Statistics Press Release*, May 17, 2000 [www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/press/ipv.pr].

US General Accounting Office. *Domestic Violence: Prevalence and Implications for Employment Among Welfare Recipients*. GAO/HEHS-99-12. November, 1998.

Yllo, K.A. and M.A. Straus. "Patriarchy and Violence against Wives: The Impact of Structural and Normative Factors," in *Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families*, edited by M.A. Straus and R.J. Gelles. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1990.

VI. APPENDIX

The results from two separate regressions are included in Table A1. Model #2, which generated the results reported in Table 3, includes all variables that are likely to affect the likelihood of abuse. Model #1 omits those variables – employment status, household income, and marital status - that may be endogenous. We report the results both with and without the potentially endogenous variables instead of attempting IV techniques because the NCVS does not include variables to use as proper instruments. The probit coefficients are followed by the partial derivatives¹⁰ (evaluated at the sample means) in parenthesis.

Table A1 (Attached at the end of the report)

Table 1: Average Characteristics of Battered Women Compared with Other Women

	Women Reporting Abuse by Intimate Partner (N=1863)	Other Women (N=523,752)
Continuous Variables:		
Age	31.20	46.03
# Children under age 12	1.12	0.51
# Children ages 12-17	0.31	0.25
Dummy Variables:		
Employed	61%	55%
Race:		
White Non-Hispanic	74%	77%
Black	16%	11%
Hispanic	8%	8%
Other Minority Race	2%	4%
Marital Status:		
Married	16%	57%
Divorced or separated	51%	13%
Single	33%	30%
Education:		
Less than high school	22%	18%
High school degree (only)	67%	60%
College degree or more	10%	20%
Education not reported	1%	2%
Region:		
New England	4%	5%
Middle Atlantic	11%	15%
South Atlantic	14%	18%
East North Central	19%	17%
West North Central	6%	7%
East South Central	6%	6%
West South Central	13%	11%
Mountain	9%	5%
Pacific	18%	16%
Income:		
HH income less than \$10,000	29%	12%
HH income between \$10,000 and \$20,000	22%	16%
HH income between \$20,000 and \$40,000	23%	26%
HH income over \$40,000	16%	31%
HH income not reported	10%	14%

Table 2: Selected Characteristics of County Variables

Variable	County-level	Individual- level (weighted)
County (of residence) has at least one ...		
Program	42%	85%
Shelter	35%	82%
Hotline	40%	85%
Safe Home	8%	20%
Legal services	30%	74%
Counseling	39%	83%
Rape counseling	21%	41%
Batterer's program	12%	43%
Children's program	27%	74%
Emergency transportation	33%	71%
Average number in county (of residence)		
Programs	0.59	3.52
Shelters	0.43	2.35
Hotlines	0.53	3.02
Safe homes	0.09	0.40
Legal services	0.38	2.19
Counseling programs	0.52	3.02
Rape counseling programs	0.23	0.83
Batterer's programs	0.15	0.96
Children's programs	0.35	2.42
Emergency transportation services	0.39	1.89
Weighted Means (by individuals)		
AFDC Payment		\$358
Population		986,754
Education Ratio (% women with college degrees/% men with college degrees)		0.90
Female Labor Force Participation Rate		57%

Table 3: Probit Results (N=530,487)

	Significant	Sign
Individual-level variables:		
Age	Yes	-
Black	Yes	-
Hispanic	Yes	-
Other minority race	Yes	-
High school only	No	
College degree	Yes	-
Education not reported	No	
Number of children < age 12	Yes	+
Number of children between ages 12 & 18	Yes	+
Employed	No	
Married	Yes	-
Household income, < \$10,000	Yes	+
Household income, \$10,000<x<\$20,000	Yes	+
Household income, \$20,000<x<\$40,000	Yes	+
Household income not reported	Yes	+
Regional variables:		
Middle Atlantic	No	
South Atlantic	No	
East North Central	Yes	+
West North Central	No	
East South Central	Yes	+
West South Central	Yes	+
Mountain	Yes	+
Pacific	Yes	+
County variables:		
% Females in Labor Force	No	
College Education Gender Ratio (Female/Male)	Yes	-
Number of shelters	No	
Number of safe homes	No	
Number of emergency transport services	No	
Number of hotlines	No	
Number of counseling programs	No	
Number of rape counseling programs	No	
Number of batterers' programs	No	
Number of children's programs	No	
Number of legal services programs	Yes	-
AFDC average payment	Yes	+
Population	No	
Time	No	

Table A1: Probit Results (N=530,487)

	Model #1	Model #2
Individual-level variables:		
Age	-0.0212 (-0.000115)**	-0.0167 (-0.000744)**
Black	0.0623 (0.000364)**	-0.1372 (-0.000525)**
Hispanic	-0.2388 (-0.000984)**	-0.2852 (-0.000908)**
Other minority race	-0.3081 (-0.001128)**	-0.3399 (-0.000971)**
High school only	-0.1212 (-0.000686)**	-0.0052 (-0.000023)
College degree	-0.3321 (-0.001397)**	-0.1293 (-0.000515)**
Education not reported	-0.2059 (-0.000844)**	0.0648 (0.000318)
Number of children < age 12	0.0899 (0.000489)**	0.1507 (0.000671)**
Number of children between ages 12 & 18	0.0079 (0.000043)	0.0325 (0.000145)**
Employed		0.0323 (0.119)
Married		-0.6168 (-0.003422)**
Household income, < \$10,000		0.2797 (0.001729)**
Household income, \$10,000<x<\$20,000		0.2090 (0.001161)**
Household income, \$20,000<x<\$40,000		0.0711 (0.000333)**
Household income not reported		0.1056 (0.000531)**
Regional variables:		
Middle Atlantic	-0.0131 (0.801)	0.0201 (0.732)
South Atlantic	0.0402 (0.516)	0.0787 (0.256)
East North Central	0.1062 (0.049)**	0.1540 (0.010)**
West North Central	0.0721 (0.232)	0.0907 (0.188)
East South Central	0.1074 (0.161)	0.1938 (0.026)**
West South Central	0.1865 (0.009)**	0.2170 (0.006)**
Mountain	0.2320 (0.00173)**	0.2492 (<0.001)**
Pacific	0.1253 (0.008)**	0.1796 (0.001)**
County and state variables:		
% Females in Labor Force	-0.0022 (-0.159)	0.0010 (0.602)
College Education Gender Ratio (Female/Male)	-0.2274 (-0.003)**	-0.2135 (0.010)**
Shelter	-0.0039 (-0.833)	-0.0193 (0.353)
Hotline	0.0196 (0.271)	0.0200 (0.292)
Counseling	0.0034 (0.886)	0.0105 (0.703)
Batterers' program	0.0049 (0.713)	0.0163 (0.254)
Children's program	0.0034 (0.817)	0.0059 (0.711)
Rape counseling	-0.0007 (-0.955)	0.0083 (0.558)
Emergency transportation	0.0158 (0.245)	-0.0027 (0.855)
Safe Home	-0.0254 (-0.164)	-0.0324 (0.102)*
Legal Services	-0.0262 (-0.031)**	-0.0279 (0.032)**
AFDC average payment	0.0003 (0.015)**	0.0003 (0.033)**
Population	-0.0195e-06 (-0.293)	-0.0213e-07 (0.918)
Time trend	-0.0015 (-1.426)	0.0003 (0.240)
Constant	-1.677 **	-2.1156 (<0.001)
Pseudo R2	0.09	0.14

*Significant at 10%, **Significant at 5%

* This work was completed while the authors were fellows at the Carnegie Mellon Census Research Data Center with funding from the National Consortium of Violence Research. We thank Dave Merrill and Sara Markowitz for data and computing assistance and two anonymous referees for helpful comments. The opinions and findings herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the opinions or official findings of the US Bureau of the Census. Any errors are our own.

Farmer: Associate Professor of Economics, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, AR. Phone 501-575-6093, Fax 501-575-3241, E-mail AmyF@Walton.UARK.Edu.

Tiefenthaler: Associate Professor of Economics, Colgate University, Hamilton, NY. Phone: 315-228-7523, Fax 315-228-7033, Email Tiefenthaler@Mail.Colgate.Edu.

¹ It is important to note that there is controversy over the DOJ's statistics on the incidence of domestic violence. For example, in a recent national study, the National Violence Against Women Survey, Tjaden and Thoennes [1998] find the rate of domestic violence to be significantly higher than that resulting from the DOJ's National Crime Victimization Survey. However, there is no other time series on the incidence of domestic violence to question the NCVS finding that the rate of domestic violence is falling over time.

² Straus [1994] and Yllo and Straus [1990] use a gender equity index to show that states exhibiting more inequality have higher rates of abuse (although Yllo and Straus find a curvilinear relationship). Levinson [1989] finds that countries with high gender inequality also have rates of wife abuse.

³ Approximately .3% of our sample of women over 18 reported to be victims of domestic violence. This is about half of the rate of 7.5 per 1000 reported by the Bureau of Justice

Statistics using the same data. The discrepancy resulted because we categorize a woman as battered if she has been a victim in the past six months while the DOJ generates annual estimates.

⁴ The *Directory* is a periodic (not annual) publication and, therefore, we used the 1994 county data for all seven years of individual-level data.

⁵ The US General Accounting Office [1998] surveys the literature on the incidence of domestic violence among welfare recipients, which is shown to be significantly greater (between 16% and 56%) than that of the general population (1%-2%).

⁶ These results were generated from a probit estimation because the dependent variable is categorical (1=abused by an intimate partner, 0=not abused by an intimate). The NCVS is a stratified, multi-stage cluster sample and, as a result, is not entirely random. Consequently, weighting regression with appropriate corrections of the standard errors is required to obtain unbiased estimates. Weighting reduced the sample size to 530,487 because weights are missing for some women. The estimates could also be biased by the panel nature of the sample. Including multiple observations on the same woman is likely to cause correlation of the errors. We also corrected for this potential problem.

⁷ The results from an alternative specification of the model that omits potentially endogenous variables (marital status, woman's employment status, and household income) are also included and discussed in the Appendix. Marital status is the most likely to be endogenous as women who are married may be less likely to admit to being abused. Re-estimating the model without this one variable results in no significant changes in the results (in terms of signs and significance).

⁸ In other specifications of the empirical model, we substituted the existence of any domestic violence program in the county and the number of programs providing services in a county for the types of services these programs offered. While there were no significant changes in the signs and significance of the other variables, neither the existence of a domestic violence

program (equal to 1 if any of the 9 service variables are equal to 1) nor the number of these programs was a significant predictor of the incidence of domestic violence. Replacing the existence of a shelter with the number of shelter beds in the county also did not significantly alter the results.

⁹ Because of data limitations, we use 1994 and 1999 data for the number of legal service programs.

¹⁰ The partial derivatives presented for dummy variables are for the discrete change from 0 to 1. In evaluating the percentage contribution of the significant variables in explaining the decline in domestic violence the regular partials were used.