

FISCAL NOTE

Bill Version: HB 92

(H) Publish Date: 3/5/99

**STATE OF ALASKA
1999 LEGISLATIVE SESSION**

Revision Date/Time (Note if correction)	March 3, 1999	Dept. Affected	Revenue
Title	Municipal Taxation of Alcohol	BRU	Revenue Operations
Sponsor	Representative Davis	Component	Income and Excise Audit
Requester	CRA	Component Serial No.	113

Expenditures/Revenues (Thousands of Dollars)

Note: Amounts do not include inflation unless otherwise noted below.

OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005
Personal Services						
Travel						
Contractual						
Supplies						
Equipment						
Land & Structures						
Grants & Claims						
Miscellaneous						
TOTAL OPERATING	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES						
-----------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

CHANGE IN REVENUES (decrease)	**	**	**	**	**	**
--------------------------------------	----	----	----	----	----	----

FUND SOURCE (Thousands of Dollars)

FUND SOURCE	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005
1002 Federal Receipts						
1003 GF Match						
1004 GF						
1005 GF/Program Receipts						
1037 GF/Mental Health						
Other (Specify Type)						
TOTAL	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Estimate of current year (FY99) cost: 0.0

POSITIONS

POSITIONS	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005
Full-time						
Part-time						
Temporary						

ANALYSIS: *(Attach a separate page if necessary)*

** The proposed legislation may cause the state to lose a small amount of state alcohol tax revenues. This revenue loss would be due to the decrease in consumption because of an increase in price. The percentage change in quantity consumed as a result of a percentage change in price is called the price elasticity of demand. If we assume that some municipalities that currently have no sales tax on alcohol enact one, prices would most likely increase. There are many different estimates of the price elasticity demand for alcohol. They usually differ by the type of alcohol with the lowest elasticity being for beer. I have seen elasticity's that range from -.12 to -1.07 for beer, from -.13 to -1.8 for liquor and from -.27 to -2.37 for wine. One publication suggests the use of -.35 for all alcohol types. This would imply that for a 1% increase in price consumption would decrease by 1/3 of 1%. Given the uncertainties involved and not knowing which if any municipalities will increase their alcohol tax, DOR cannot estimate the loss of revenue.

Prepared by	Brett Fried, Economist	
Division	Income and Excise Audit	Phone <u>465-3682</u>
Approved by		Date/Time <u>March 3, 1999</u>
Commissioner		Wilson L. Condon
Agency	Department of Revenue	

PREPARER TO PROVIDE ALL DISTRIBUTION COPIES TO GOVERNOR'S LEGISLATIVE OFFICE

For further distribution information, call the Governor's Legislative Office