

HOUSE FINANCE COMMITTEE

April 5, 2016

5:02 p.m.

5:02:46 PM

CALL TO ORDER

Co-Chair Thompson called the House Finance Committee meeting to order at 5:02 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Representative Mark Neuman, Co-Chair  
Representative Steve Thompson, Co-Chair  
Representative Dan Saddler, Vice-Chair  
Representative Bryce Edgmon  
Representative Les Gara  
Representative Lynn Gattis  
Representative David Guttenberg  
Representative Scott Kawasaki  
Representative Cathy Munoz  
Representative Lance Pruitt  
Representative Tammie Wilson

MEMBERS ABSENT

None

ALSO PRESENT

Jane Pierson, Staff, Representative Steve Thompson;  
Representative Cathy Tilton, Sponsor, House District 12;  
Ben Ellis, Director, Alaska Division of State Parks and  
Outdoor Recreation, Department of Natural Resources; Steven  
Samuelson, Self, Petersberg; Randall Hoffbeck,  
Commissioner, Department of Revenue; Brandon S. Spanos,  
Deputy Director, Tax Division, Department of Revenue; Jerry  
Burnett, Deputy Commissioner, Treasury Division, Department  
of Revenue; Mark Luiken, Commissioner, Department of  
Transportation and Public Facilities.

PRESENT VIA TELECONFERENCE

Al Barrette, Self, Fairbanks; Rod Arno, Alaska Outdoor  
Council, Palmer.

SUMMARY

HB 249 ELECTRONIC TAX RETURNS & MOTOR FUEL TAX

HB 249 was HEARD and HELD in committee for further consideration.

HB 250 INDIV. INCOME TAX: CREDITS; RETURNS

HB 250 was HEARD and HELD in committee for further consideration.

HB 319 SNOWMOBILE REGISTRATION FEES

CSHB 319 (FIN) was REPORTED out of committee with a "do pass" recommendation and with one new fiscal impact note from the Department of Administration.

Co-Chair Thompson reviewed the schedule for the meeting.

[5:03:36 PM](#)

#hb319

HOUSE BILL NO. 319

"An Act relating to registration fees for snowmobiles and off-highway vehicles."

[5:03:36 PM](#)

Co-Chair Neuman MOVED to ADOPT proposed committee substitute for HB 319, Work Draft 29-LS1444\H (Wallace/Martin, 4/1/16). There being NO OBJECTION, it was so ordered.

JANE PIERSON, STAFF, REPRESENTATIVE STEVE THOMPSON, explained that the only difference in the new version was a repealer added for July 1, 2019.

[5:04:54 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE CATHY TILTON, SPONSOR, HOUSE DISTRICT 12, explained HB 319:

Passage of House Bill 319 would increase two-year snowmobile registration fees from \$10 to \$20 and allow a six-year registration fee of \$50.

The measure has support from snow machine users as a way to help the state during cash-strapped times and back funding to develop and maintain snowmobile trails and provide safety and educational programs.

Current snowmobile registration fees generate up to \$250,000 a year for the Snowmobile Trail Development Program which is managed by the Department of Natural Resources' Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation and the nine-member Snowmobile Trails Advisory Council (SnowTRAC).

SnowTRAC approved a resolution last August in support of the provisions of HB 319, saying Alaska's snowmobile trails program is revenue-neutral, self-funded, and user-based. The council also said the demands for trail maintenance, development, and safety continue to grow and that support for winter trails brings increased business and recreational opportunities to communities across the state.

HB 319 helps promote snowmobile user safety and enjoys support from those who are willing to pay more for a service they need and enjoy.

[5:08:52 PM](#)

Co-Chair Neuman wanted to clarify that no state money would be funding the bill.

Representative Tilton responded correct.

Co-Chair Neuman asked when the rates were last adjusted.

Representative Tilton responded that the rates were adjusted in 2008, at the program's inception.

Co-Chair Neuman asked whether the groups were supportive of the bill, because of the high cost of fuel.

Representative Tilton replied in the affirmative.

Representative Gattis wondered whether the stickers were the same as the state park stickers.

Representative Tilton replied that the stickers for state parks were a separate program. She explained that the

registration fees on a snow mobile was at the point of purchase.

Representative Gattis wondered whether an unregistered snowmobile would be against the law.

Co-Chair Thompson explained that it was just like registering the car.

Representative Gattis felt confused about the difference between the separate registration stickers.

Co-Chair Neuman stressed that a snow machine must be registered in order to use it on state land. He explained that the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) would use the money for that sticker for trail grooming.

Representative Gattis surmised that a one must have a state park sticker and a registration sticker.

Co-Chair Neuman shared that a state park sticker was not required, but a snow machine must be registered to use on state land.

Representative Gattis placed on record that she had been registered the entire time.

[5:13:27 PM](#)

Representative Guttenberg wondered if there was a list of grantees.

Representative Tilton replied that the monies were delivered through the capital projects through the Snowmobile Trail Development Program. She explained that SnowTRAC administered the funds. She announced that, in the last year's cycle, the funds were administered to seventeen different organizations such as Big Lake, the Denali Highways Trails Club, Hatcher's Pass, Juneau, the Chena River State Recreational Area, Petersville, Willow Area Trails, and the Yukon Quest Trail.

Representative Guttenberg wondered if the grants were allocated proportionately by community or in another way.

Representative Tilton deferred to Ben Ellis.

5:16:09 PM

BEN ELLIS, DIRECTOR, ALASKA DIVISION OF STATE PARKS AND OUTDOOR RECREATION, DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES, stated that the percentage of distribution depended on the type of request. He shared that SnowTRAC was an advisory board, and ranked the grant requests. He stated that there were approximately 50 percent more requests than funds available. He stated that the recipients would receive a portion of the request, and either reduce grooming activity or seek alternative funding. He stressed that the requests were granted at the beginning of the season, so there was no way of knowing the exact grooming requirements. He stated that leftover money was rolled over year to year, and became part of the entire pool that could be used for safety and education the following year.

Representative Wilson wondered whether there was any attempt to allocate funds based on areas in which people were registered.

Mr. Ellis replied in the negative.

Representative Wilson wondered whether a scoring process was used.

Mr. Ellis responded that there was a scoring process established by the SnowTRAC Board. He stressed that it was an advisory board, so there were times when he may not adhere to the recommendations.

Representative Gattis relayed that there were many people that purchased registrations in Anchorage who would use the machines in the Mat-Su

5:22:51 PM

AL BARRETTE, SELF, FAIRBANKS (via teleconference), strongly opposed HB 319. He talked about people who never re-registered their machines in the Interior. He did not feel that he should have to support a dog race with his registration fee. He referred to Page 1, Line 4 which defined an "Off-road vehicle." He thanked the committee.

5:25:38 PM

ROD ARNO, ALASKA OUTDOOR COUNCIL, PALMER (via teleconference), supported the legislation. Users were willing to pay their own way. He thought that with the additional in the committee substitute would give the users the opportunity to observe the use of the funds to see the benefits of the program. He thanked the sponsor for putting the bill forward and urged support for the bill.

[5:27:37 PM](#)

STEVEN SAMUELSON, SELF, PETERSBERG, did not support the bill. He had paid registration for his snow machine. He had never seen grooming done on the trails he had used. He did not support paying fees that would cover the cost of grooming elsewhere.

Co-Chair Thompson CLOSED public testimony.

Co-Chair Thompson discussed the fiscal note.

Co-Chair Neuman was a high use snow machine user. He remarked that much of the money would be used for safety instruction classes.

[5:33:00 PM](#)

Vice-Chair Saddler relayed that in his experience thought it was appropriate that a self-funded program benefit the recreation zones.

Representative Edgmon was going to support the bill but did not think much of the funding would reach the area he represents.

Co-Chair Thompson addressed the sunset date.

Representative Wilson mentioned that in Section 6 there was a repealer but another part took effect. She could not support the bill.

[5:35:44 PM](#)

Ms. Pierson explained that the way it was written if it did not be re-implemented. The repealer returns to the previous registration fee.

Representative Wilson stressed that the tags were required, but would require no action by the legislature in 2019.

Ms. Pierson responded that Representative Wilson was correct.

Representative Wilson had a problem with the bill was because she did not think that all users would benefit. Her larger issue was because it was not a user fee. She was not willing to place additional taxes on people.

[5:38:16 PM](#)

Co-Chair Neuman MOVED to REPORT CSHB 319 (FIN) out of committee with individual recommendations and the accompanying fiscal note. There being NO OBJECTION, it was so ordered.

CSHB 319 (FIN) was REPORTED out of committee with a "do pass" recommendation and with one new fiscal impact note from the Department of Administration.

[5:38:16 PM](#)

AT EASE

[5:41:22 PM](#)

RECONVENED

[5:41:38 PM](#)

#hb250

HOUSE BILL NO. 250

"An Act relating to the taxation of income of individuals; repealing tax credits applied against the tax on individuals under the Alaska Net Income Tax Act; and providing for an effective date."

[5:41:59 PM](#)

RANDALL HOFFBECK, COMMISSIONER, DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE, introduced himself. He recognized the bill was one of the most controversial piece of legislation. He explained that why an income tax was chosen over other taxes. The bill would establish a personal income tax equal to six percent of taxpayers total federal tax liability for Alaska residents and nonresidents with income from a source in the

state. Because the tax that would be established by the bill is calculated based on federal tax liability and not on income, the bill effectively incorporates federal brackets and exemptions and so permits this bill, and the personal income tax system it would create to be as simple and transparent as possible.

[5:46:31 PM](#)

BRANDON S. SPANOS, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, TAX DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE, introduced the PowerPoint Presentation: "Individual Income Tax: HB 250."

Mr. Spanos addressed slide 2: "Individual Income Tax."

"An Act relating to the taxation of income of individuals; repealing tax credits applied against the tax on individuals under the Alaska Net Income Tax Act; and providing for an effective date."

Mr. Spanos reviewed slide 3: "Income Tax History."

Began in 1949 at 10 percent of federal tax liability

By 1961, the tax was 16 percent of federal tax liability

In 1975, Alaska switched from federal tax liability to its own tax brackets

Ranged from 3 percent to 14.5 percent on taxable income

Alaska repealed personal income tax in 1980 after oil revenue boom

Mr. Spanos turned to slide 4: "Tax Proposal."

Creates a tax on an individual's income. The proposed rate is 6 percent of a person's federal income tax liability

Mr. Spanos explained slide 5: "Income Tax Proposal (Continued)." He stated that the slide addressed the current federal tax brackets.

Vice-Chair Saddler looked at the third column and wondered whether that was taxable income, or gross income.

Mr. Spanos responded that it was taxable income.

Mr. Spanos slide 6: "Income Tax Proposal (Continued)."

Tax applies to nonresidents' income from a source in Alaska

Residents receive credit for taxes paid in other states

Provides for employers to withhold taxes and remit them to the state

[5:50:11 PM](#)

Representative Guttenberg asked how he defined resident.

Mr. Spanos responded that in the bill the term "resident" was defined several times.

Representative Wilson wondered if the \$3 billion of "out of state" workers were defined as residents or nonresidents.

Mr. Spanos stated that the \$3 billion was wages earned in Alaska by nonresidents. He understood that there may be other nonresidents who may receive the Permanent Fund Dividend (PFD). He shared that there were other sources of income, other than wages, that would be taxable for residents.

Representative Wilson did not feel that the definition would work.

Vice-Chair Saddler queried the amount of money earned in wages by Alaska residents in Alaska, if \$3 billion was earned by non-residents.

Commissioner Hoffbeck would have to provide the information at a later time.

Representative Pruitt wondered whether military personnel would be taxed, or was it all the other individuals who could receive the PFD but not live the state.

Mr. Spanos responded to the extent that the pay resident tax, if they were to pay federal income tax.

Commissioner Hoffbeck stated that the income tax would be based on their income in Alaska or from an Alaska source.

Representative Pruitt thought it was cumbersome to manage the income tax, to require those living outside of the state to pay the income tax on the PFD.

Commissioner Hoffbeck replied that their residency allowed for a credit in other states against the Alaska tax. He explained that some of the money earned in other states could be transferred if the Alaska tax rate was higher than the other state. He stated that the individual would need to fill out a state income tax return.

Representative Pruitt asked about the cost to the state. He was skeptical about really collecting any money.

Commissioner Hoffbeck agreed that all taxes would have to be processed.

[5:56:44 PM](#)

Vice-Chair Saddler mentioned military members. He wondered if those living outside the state, retaining residency, who received a PFD would be required to pay the state income tax.

Mr. Spanos replied that other states dealt with the same issue. He stated that they would be required to pay the taxes in their home state.

Vice-Chair Saddler surmised that they would be subject to Alaska income tax.

Mr. Spanos agreed.

Representative Gara surmised that the tax was a percentage of federal tax. He stressed that the state taxes were deducted from the federal tax. He wondered how that loop would be solved.

Mr. Spanos stated the IRS made it fairly simple with the use of W-2's.

Mr. Spanos continued to discuss slide 6.

Mr. Spanos moved to slide 7: "Income Tax Estimates: Estimated tax for married couple filing jointly with 2 children." He reported that he slide showed an example of what an individual or family might pay in taxes.

Mr. Spanos provided another example on slide 8: "Income Tax Estimates: Estimated tax for head of household with 2 children." He pointed out that the head of household had a slightly different deduction allowance.

[6:01:10 PM](#)

Mr. Spanos advanced to slide 9: "Relative Tax Rate":

43 states currently have an income tax

Among states with an income tax, Alaska's rate would be lowest

North Dakota would be second-lowest

Average state income tax is about 30 percent of federal liability, five times Alaska's proposed rate

Six states would still have zero state income tax<sup>1</sup>

Two states tax only dividends and interest<sup>2</sup>

Mr. Spanos discussed slide 10: "Impacts of Tax Proposal":

Income from subchapter S corporations and partnerships will be taxed

Taxed on income with a source in Alaska

Not currently subject to state Corporate Income Tax

Income earned in Alaska by both non-residents and residents will be taxed

Rough estimate: 20 percent - 30 percent of Alaskans would pay zero tax

Mr. Spanos scrolled to slide 11: "Revenue Impact":

- DOR estimates \$100 million in FY17 due to the tax taking effect in January 2017
  - This amount is from withholding
  - No tax returns filed until April 2018
- DOR estimates \$200 million in FY18 based on modeling using aggregated federal income data for Alaska residents

Mr. Spanos moved to slide 12: "Implementation Cost."

- Implementing an individual income tax in 18 months will be a significant challenge
  - Need to draft regulations
  - Need to design, develop, and test technology to administer tax that would have estimated 450,000 tax returns filed annually.
- Estimated \$250,000 supplemental appropriation for a contractor to work with DOR on an implementation plan
- Estimated \$14,000,000 one-time capital appropriation to build income tax into our current tax revenue system
  - Includes withholding and online filing
- Annual staffing cost of about \$6,000,000 for 52 FTE employees

[6:04:43 PM](#)

Commissioner Hoffbeck addressed slide 13: "Closing the Budget Gap" and slide 14: "Closing the Budget Gap (Continued)." The components used to close the budget gap included the FY 17 baseline revenue (after proposed legislation; FY 17 spending reductions; and new revenue components.

Mr. Spanos asked if he should address the sectional analysis.

Co-Chair Thompson replied in the negative and relayed it could be taken up at a later date. He recalled that the income tax in the 1960s was a one-page form and very

simple. He felt that the current system was too complicated. He wondered if there was a simpler method.

Mr. Spanos replied that the form would still be simple, but it was based on the complicated federal income tax. He stated that the cost projection was based one-half Montana's structure. He stated that Vermont had a similar population as Alaska, so they had relayed that they believed Alaska's proposal was reasonable. He stated that the auditors and computer system were essential to processing the system.

Co-Chair Thompson wondered whether the federal system would be connected to the state's system.

[6:07:46 PM](#)

Mr. Spanos replied in the affirmative.

Representative Wilson pointed to slide 8, and surmised that one would pay \$7 dollars for a \$40,000 income; and \$97 for \$50,000.

Mr. Spanos replied in the affirmative.

Representative Wilson surmised that the state would have someone do all of the paperwork for \$7.00.

Representative Gattis referred to nonresident pilots flying Alaskan routes and sports teams. She wondered if the state would recoup any of those dollars.

Mr. Spanos replied that most states had some kind of daily limit income earned in the state.

Representative Gattis hoped the state did not use California as a role model.

[6:10:09 PM](#)

Vice-Chair Saddler queried the rates for those individuals who earned higher than \$100,000.

Co-Chair Thompson asked if he was referring to slide 5.

Commissioner Hoffbeck replied that the highest rate was 2.38 percent, and agreed to provide more information.

Representative Guttenberg referred to the state form that specified how much state and federal taxes were paid.

Commissioner Hoffbeck replied that a person would pay whatever their federal tax bracket and 20 percent of that for state income tax.

Representative Munoz asked about auditors.

Mr. Spanos answered replied with a rough estimate and the department relied on a contractor to see if they estimated too high or low.

Representative Munoz wondered if the audits would be random and meaningful.

Mr. Spanos replied in the affirmative.

[6:13:39 PM](#)

Representative Gara wondered if the state income tax was deducted from the federal income tax.

Co-Chair Thompson replied in the affirmative.

Representative Gara requested a chart related to the percentages related to what would actually be paid by the individual.

Commissioner Hoffbeck agreed that the department could provide the information.

Representative Gara wondered whether everyone had the opportunity to take tax reductions or were itemizations required.

Mr. Spanos responded that only those who itemized would qualify for the reductions.

Representative Gara queried families and single people.

Commissioner Hoffbeck thought the information had been provided previously.

Representative Munoz wondered why the fiscal note had a smaller number of employees in the fiscal note.

Commissioner Hoffbeck replied that he limited the number of employees.

[6:16:39 PM](#)

Vice-Chair Saddler asked whether someone under 16 would be subject the taxes.

Mr. Spanos responded that it depended on their level of income. He stressed that if they filed federally they also must file for the state. He shared that the parents may need to pay taxes if the minor earned at a certain level. He agreed to provide more information.

Vice-Chair Saddler wondered whether the 20 percent of Alaskans who would not pay were citizens or wage earners.

Mr. Spanos referenced the ISER report. He believed it was wage earners.

Vice-Chair Saddler queried the standard deduction.

Mr. Spanos responded that it was \$12,600 for a married couple; and \$6,300 for a single individual.

HB 250 was HEARD and HELD in committee for further consideration.

[6:19:00 PM](#)

#hb249

HOUSE BILL NO. 249

"An Act requiring the electronic submission of a tax return or report with the Department of Revenue; relating to the motor fuel tax; and providing for an effective date."

[6:19:32 PM](#)

JERRY BURNETT, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER, TREASURY DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE, would run through the presentation. It was a simple presentation which he introduced the PowerPoint Presentation: "Motor Fuel Tax: HB 249."

Mr. Burnett looked at slide 2: "Motor Fuel Tax Increase."

"An Act relating to the motor fuel tax; relating to the duties of the commissioner of revenue; relating to the disposition of revenue from the motor fuel tax; and providing for an effective date."

Mr. Burnett slide 3: "Motor Fuel Tax History."

Began in 1945

Tax rates have increased over time, but structure unchanged

Last increase: highway 1970, marine 1977, aviation fuel 1994

Mr. Burnett advanced to slide 4: "Motor Fuel Tax History (Continued)."

Tax was suspended from Sept. 1, 2008, to Aug. 31, 2009

In 2015, HB 158 added \$0.0095 surcharge on motor fuels and some other refined fuels

Intended for spill prevention and response fund

Mr. Burnett turned to slide 5: "Motor Fuel Tax Proposal." He explained that the proposal was to increase the taxes, but to change the off-road use credit of 6 cents of the 8 cents. He stressed that it required electronic filing; and provided an exemption process.

Representative Guttenberg referred to the jet fuel. He wondered if an analysis of the international travel.

Mr. Burnett responded that most of the jet fuel used for international travel was exempt from state taxation. He stated that the genesis of the large increase was from the Aviation Advisory Committee. There were proposals in the previous year to add landing fees at certain state certificated airports. The committee advised the state to raise the jet fuel tax, rather than increase the landing fees.

Co-Chair Thompson assumed the federal government would be exempt.

Representative Guttenberg asked who would be paying for jet fuel.

Mr. Burnett responded that it would be regional and domestic carriers.

[6:24:58 PM](#)

Mr. Burnett discussed slide 6: "Relative Motor Fuel Tax Rate."

Alaska's fuel taxes are among lowest in U.S.1  
Highway fuel: lowest  
Jet fuel: 35th out of 50  
Aviation gas: 24th out of 50  
Under this bill, Alaska taxes would be:  
Below national average (20.17 cents)  
for highway fuel  
Above national average for jet/aviation fuel

Mr. Burnett moved to slide 7: "Impacts of Tax Proposal."

Gas prices at the pump would rise  
  
More aviation taxes to fund certificated urban and rural airports  
  
Requested by aviation advisory committee as preferable to landing fee increases

Mr. Burnett advanced to slide 8: "Revenue Impact."

Dept. of Revenue estimates increasing the tax rate will more than double tax collections  
  
Additional revenue about \$49 million per year  
  
\$0.2 million will be shared with municipal-owned airports  
  
Remainder: general fund and special accounts for road, water transport, and aviation facilities

Mr. Burnett turned to slide 9: "Revenue Impact (Continued)":

Estimates based on fall 2015 revenue forecast

Does not account for changes in fuel demand or stockpiling

Mr. Burnett talked about slide 10: "Implementation Cost."

Dept. of Revenue must update:

Tax Revenue Management System (TRMS)  
Revenue Online (ROL) which allows a taxpayer to file a return and apply for a dealer license online  
Tax return forms

One-time implementation cost of \$50,000 to recreate tax forms and reprogram and test the tax system to accommodate the rate changes

No additional costs to administer the tax program

Mr. Burnett moved to slide 11: "Motor Fuel Tax—Changes made in Committee Substitute":

If average price of ANS crude oil is more than \$85 per barrel during the previous year—no change to current tax rates

If average price of ANS crude oil is less than \$85 per barrel during the previous year—tax rates increase  
Motor fuel used for commercial fishing remains at 5 cents a gallon

Tax increase sunsets after 2 years (July 1, 2018)

[6:31:45 PM](#)

Vice-Chair Saddler asked what the commercial fishing exemption.

Mr. Burnett responded that it was \$4.2 million.

Vice-Chair Saddler wondered whether the state could take advantage of more federal transportation funding with the increase in fuel taxes.

Mr. Burnett responded that the highway taxes go towards the general fund, and the general fund paid the match for federal dollars. He stated that there was no direct linkage, but the state tax and number of gallons were reported. He assumed that the U.S. Congress may see a linkage when examining the authorization bills for the state.

Co-Chair Thompson did not believe that the federal government turned away any money collected from highway dollars.

Mr. Burnett explained slide 12: "Closing the Budget Gap." He explained that the motor fuel tax was after changes to oil and gas; and income tax.

Co-Chair Thompson thought the state had been collecting about \$80 million in fuel tax

Mr. Burnett thought the number was closer to \$40 million. He stated that the proposal would bring the number closer to \$90 million.

[6:34:53 PM](#)

Representative Wilson wondered if the adjustment had already occurred with the change from collected land fees to collecting the fuel tax.

Mr. Burnett replied that there was a recommendation to increase the tax, but it had not yet been increased.

Representative Wilson wondered if the taxes would be increased, should the bill fail to pass.

Mr. Burnett replied that it would probably require an increase in landing fees.

Representative Wilson stressed that there would not be an increase to landing fees.

Mr. Burnett indicated she was correct, and that it would be new landing fees.

Representative Wilson queried a way to balance to ensure that airports were not paying more than what they were able to utilize, and not pay for someone else's airport. She

wondered whether Anchorage and Fairbanks should have a separate rate than other airports.

Mr. Burnett deferred to Commissioner Luiken.

MARK LUIKEN, COMMISSIONER, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC FACILITIES, answered that the airports were already covered by the carriers through landing fees, rates, fees, etc. He stated that the tax would impact the carriers across the state. He stated that the board made the recommendation, because they felt it was the fairest way to impact all of the users of the system and distribute the cost the most fairly. He stated that the board did not believe the landing fees was fair, because it would only be levied at certificated airports.

Co-Chair Thompson asked how many airports the Department of Transportation and Public Facilities (DOT/PF) maintained.

Commissioner Luiken replied that DOT/PF maintained 249 airports in the state.

Representative Wilson felt that the legislation was not fair to the Fairbanks airport.

Commissioner Luiken stated that the larger airports supported the broader system in the state.

Representative Wilson mentioned that the air carriers were not very happy with the legislation.

Co-Chair Thompson remarked that he had hard form air carriers also.

[6:40:51 PM](#)

Representative Pruitt wondered whether FedEx and UPS would pay the tax.

Commissioner Luiken understood that for those cargo carriers flying a domestic route the jet fuel tax would apply.

Representative Pruitt thought Alaska was putting itself in a sticky position by tripling their taxes, because jobs were at stake.

Co-Chair Thompson asked about a comparison.

Commissioner Luiken would be happy to supply a cost comparison between Anchorage, Seattle, Portland, and Anchorage. The fact was that Alaska's jet fuel tax was only a portion of fees charged.

Mr. Burnett added that he sat on the Alaska Industrial Development and Export Authority (AIDEA) board.

[6:47:34 PM](#)

Representative Kawasaki wondered how the commercial fishing tax would be remitted.

Mr. Burnett responded that as a person pulled up to a station, the state would administer the tax through a rebate.

Vice-Chair Saddler supported moving towards a motor fuel tax rather than an airport landing tax.

HB 249 was HEARD and HELD in committee for further consideration.

Co-Chair Thompson thanked the presenters for being available. He reviewed the agenda for the following day.

#

ADJOURNMENT

[6:50:58 PM](#)

The meeting was adjourned at 6:50 p.m.