

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
SUPERIOR COURT
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
Case No. 2022-00000000-00000
HSA - HB - 2025-2025

At the end of 1982, the Division was operating 40 sites - 13 full-time LIO's, 3 part-time or session-only LIO's, and 24 teleconference centers.

Routine procedure has been that new facilities are created by legislative initiative. Once a facility has been initially funded, it is carried ahead in the Division's budget as originally established; upgrades also are dependent on legislative initiative. The Division of Public Services budgets to maintain a facility at the level established by the Legislature.

References:

LR 93 1977	CH 101 SLA 1982
CH 161 SLA 78 e.d. 10-10-78	CH 141 SLA 1982
CH 50 SLA 80 e.d. 5-31-80	Legislative Council Minutes

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON STATE AFFAIRS
LETTER OF INTENT
FOR
CSHB 193 (STATE AFFAIRS)

Mr. Speaker:

The Committee on State Affairs has had House Bill 193 under consideration, and the Committee recommends that the bill be replaced by Committee Substitute for House Bill 193, and that the Committee Substitute (CSHB 193) do pass.

The State Affairs Committee intends to reflect, through CSHB 193, a commitment to the Legislative Information & Teleconference Network and recognizes the importance of linking the government of Alaska to her people.

Testimony before the committee has clearly established that Alaska's legislative telecommunications system is unique in providing for the vital interchange of thoughts and opinions throughout our vast and diverse land.

Respectfully submitted,

Rep. Mitch Abood
Chairman

HB 193

- ✓ 1. How long has the Legislative Information & Teleconference network been in existence?
2. When we hold teleconferences both for the committee and also for our constituent meetings, we see the network operate only on the surface. Could you tell us a little about about what happens outside the meeting room?
3. How many other states have this kind of operation?
4. It comes as no surprise to any legislator or committee that wants to schedule a teleconference, that the teleconference service is booked solid at least 1-2 weeks in advance. I don't recall it being this busy last year. Has the demand increased?
5. Has you staff also increased with this demand?
6. How will the additional sites contained in HB 193 affect your present operation?

REPRESENTATIVE
ADELHEID HERRMANN
P.O. BOX 63
NAKNEK, ALASKA 99633
(907) 246-4495

Write in Juneau
POUCH V
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99611
(907) 255-4542, 465-4943

Alaska State Legislature



House of Representatives

CHAIRMAN
SPECIAL COMMITTEE
ON FISHERIES

MEMBER
TRANSPORTATION
COMMITTEE

DISTRICT 26

ADAK
AKUTAN
ALEKNAGIK
ATKA
BELKCFSKI
CLARK'S POINT
COLD BAY
DILLINGHAM
DUTCH HARBOR
EGEGIK
EKUK
EKWOK
FALSE PASS
IGIUGIG
ILIAMNA
KING COVE
KING SALMON
KOKHANOK
KOLIGANEK
LEVELOCK
MANCKOTAK
NAKNEK
NELSON LAGOON
NEWHALEN
NEW STUYAHOK
NIKOLSKI
NONDALTON
PEDRO BAY
PILOT POINT
PORT ALSWORTH
PORT HEIDEN
PORT MOLLER
PORTAGE CREEK
SAND POINT
SOUTH NAKNEK
SQUAW HARBOR
ST. GEORGE
ST. PAUL
TOGIK
TWIN HILLS
UGASHIK
UNALASKA

MEMORANDUM:

TO: Representative Mitch Abood, Chairman
House State Affairs Committee

FROM: Representative Adelheid Herrmann

DATE: March 17, 1983

SUBJECT: Amendments to HB 193

This is to inform you that I intend to request tomorrow that a Committee Substitute be adopted for HB 193 incorporating the following changes:

Line 11, change \$157,368 to \$118,026

Line 13, delete "Iliamna," add "Newhalen"

Line 13, delete "New Stuyahok,"

I will explain the proposed amendments during my oral testimony on March 18, 1983. I wanted to notify you in advance of this request.

AH/hc

STATE OF ALASKA

BILL SHEFFIELD, GOVERNOR

DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION

DIVISION OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES

POUCH C
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99811
PHONE: (907) 465-2041

March 14, 1983

Honorable Adelheid Herrmann
Alaska State Legislature
Pouch V
Room 212, Behrends Bldg.
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Dear Representative Herrmann:

Re: HB193

It has come to my attention that New Stuyahok, one of the four proposed Legislative Teleconference Network sites in HB193, does not presently have the technical capability to adequately accommodate that service.

The Division of Telecommunications Services has recently sent inquiries to all Alaskan telephone companies requesting information regarding existing or planned exchange service in Alaska's communities. Response from Bristol Bay Telephone Cooperative indicates that the certification process to extend exchange service to eight Bristol Bay area communities has begun. If certified, Bristol Bay intends to provide exchange service to New Stuyahok, but not until the last quarter of 1984. The other three communities in HB193 presently have exchange service.

I hope this information is useful. Please contact me if the Division staff or I can provide further help.

Sincerely,


Sioux Plummer, Director

Thru:


Lisa Rudd, Commissioner

SP/bb



Bristol Bay Borough

BOX 189 • NAKNEK, ALASKA 99633

JIM D. CLARK
MAYOR

TELEPHONE
(907) 246-4224

January 14, 1983

Rep. Adelheid Herrmann
House of Representatives
Pouch V
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Dear Adelheid:

Enclosed is a Resolution from the Borough Assembly requesting a legislative office with teleconference capabilities within the Borough.

We believe this office will better link us to the State Capital and keep us better informed about issues and items that affect us. We would appreciate any help you can give us.

Please call me if you have any questions or need more information.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Francis W. Mandeville".

Francis W. Mandeville
Borough Manager

FWM:bjt

Enclosure:



Bristol Bay Borough

Box 189 • NAKNEK, ALASKA 99633


RESOLUTION NO. 82-21

A RESOLUTION REQUESTING A LEGISLATIVE OFFICE WITH A TELECONFERENCE CAPABILITY IN THE BOROUGH.

- WHEREAS, important items which affect the lives of citizens in Bristol Bay Borough are introduced and debated each year in the legislature, and
- WHEREAS, public input is difficult to provide due to the long distance from the Borough and the State Capital, and
- WHEREAS, information about legislative affairs often arrives after the decision has been made, and
- WHEREAS, a Legislative Office with a teleconference line would greatly improve the information flow between the Borough and State capital and the legislators and their constituents.


NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Assembly of Bristol Bay Borough request the legislature to establish an office with teleconference capability in the Borough.

Passed this 20th day of December, 1982.



Mayor

ATTEST:



Borough Clerk

STATE OF ALASKA
THE LEGISLATURE

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS AGENCY

DIVISION OF PUBLIC SERVICES
1024 WEST SIXTH AVENUE
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-8518

January 5, 1983

Senator Bob Mulcahy
Box 246
Kodiak, Alaska 99615

Dear Senator Mulcahy:

As you requested, we have developed cost figures for session-only Legislative Information Offices and for Legislative Teleconference Centers in Iliamna and Naknek.

The attached worksheets show both one-time and recurring costs for each type of facility. We have based FY 83 recurring costs on a March 1, 1983 startup date. If it is your intent to seek funding to establish the facilities in FY 84, rather than for the balance of FY 83, the funding request should include both both the one-time costs and the coming year recurring costs.

The funding requirements would be as follows:


Iliamna - information office, 3-1-83 startup	27,605 one-time
	<u>46,894</u> recurring
	74,499
7-1-83 startup	27,605 one-time
	<u>115,873</u> recurring
	143,478
Iliamna - teleconference center, 3-1-83 startup	8,315 one-time
	<u>11,249</u> recurring
	19,564
7-1-83 startup	8,315 one-time
	<u>31,027</u> recurring
	39,342
Naknek - information office, 3-1-83 startup	27,585 one-time
	<u>45,434</u> recurring
	73,019
7-1-83 startup	27,585 one-time
	<u>111,493</u> recurring
	139,078

Senator Bob Mulcahy
January 5, 1983
Page 2

Naknek - teleconference center, 3-1-83 startup	8,315 one-time
	<u>11,249</u> recurring
	19,564
7-1-83 startup	8,315 one-time
	<u>31,027</u> recurring
	39,342

If we can provide further information, please let us know.

Very truly yours,



Judy D. Hopkins
Operations Coordinator

c: ✓ Representative-elect Adelheid Herrmann
M. R. Charney
Wally Harrison
Charity Kadow
Carol Dickason
Kathi Baltes

FACILITY DEVELOPMENT QUOTE

NAENK

Establish and operate a Legislative Teleconference Center
 March 1 through June 30, 1983

Requestor: Mulcahy/Herrmann

Prepared: 1/5/83

	ONE-TIME COSTS	RECURRING COSTS for period 3/1 thru 6/30/83	TOTAL	AMOUNT AVAILABLE FROM CURRENT YEAR FUNDS	CURRENT YEAR FUNDING REQUIREMENT	RECURRING COSTS, COMING YEAR
100 Personal Services	-0-	3272	3272	-0-	3272	9815
200 Transportation, Per Diem	1655	1900	3555	-0-	3555	1900
300 Contractual Services	480	5177	5657	-0-	5657	15532
400 Commodities	300	100	400	-0-	400	300
500 Equipment	5880	-0-	5880	-0-	5880	1080
Space	-0-	800	800	-0-	800	2400
Data Communications	-0-	-0-	0	-0-	0	-0-
<hr/>						
Totals	8315	11249	19564	0	19564	31027

See category breakdowns, attached

If funding is sought to establish and operate facility during the current fiscal year, use Current Year Funding Requirement figure. The Division of Public Services will request funds required for continuation in the coming fiscal year if current-year funding is approved.

If funding is sought to establish facility in the coming fiscal year, rather than for the balance of the current fiscal year, funding request should include One-Time Costs and Recurring Costs, Coming Year.

Category Breakdown
LEGISLATIVE TRAINING CENTER

ONE TIME COSTS

Transportation and Per diem - Administrative travel to site for interview, arrangements; staff travel to major center for training.

Contractual Services - Telephone installation; freight for initial supplies; signs, rubber stamps, notary seals.

Commodities - Initial, "staple" office supplies; maps, flags.

Equipment - Teleconference equipment, file cabinet and equipment stand, typewriter, telecopier, answering machine, tape recorder, and associated freight.

RECURRING COSTS

Personal Services - On-call moderator; includes cost of living differential where applicable and percentage for employer costs/benefits.

Transportation and Per Diem - Staff travel to major center for orientation and training, administrative travel to site for supplemental training.

Contractual Services - Telephone service, postage and mailing, pouch service, off-net tolls and bridge services, required printed materials, funds for local advertising and newspaper subscriptions; equipment repair and maintenance, freight.

Commodities - Stationery and supplies, duplicating supplies, computer commodities, library supplies.

Equipment - Routine recurring requirements for office furniture and equipment and for teleconference equipment.

Space - Funds to reimburse donor of space for janitorial and/or utilities costs if required.

H I S T O R Y

ESTABLISHMENT OF ALASKA'S
LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION FACILITIES

DIVISION OF PUBLIC SERVICES May 15, 1979

Establishment of the Division of Public Services was approved by Legislative Council May 15, 1979.

Funds for operation of the Division were transferred from the Division of Administrative Services and session funds.

Appointment of Director approved May 15, 1979.

JUNEAU INFORMATION CENTER/LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION NETWORK May, 1979

Juneau Information Center/Legislative Information Network were established with the transfer of services to the Division of Public Services.

Legislative Information Network (LIN) staffperson hired May 18, 1979.

Prior to transfer of the Juneau information facility, information support services were provided to regional facilities under the auspices of the Division of Administrative Services, Legislative Affairs Agency.

LEGISLATIVE TELECONFERENCE NETWORK February 2, 1978

LR 93, 1977, directed establishment of a Legislative Teleconference Network (LTN) to be operational in January, 1978, and to include Anchorage, Bethel, Fairbanks, Ketchikan, Juneau, and Nome. The LTN was operational February 2, 1978.

CH 161, SLA 78, Sec. 7 funded expansion and maintenance of the LTN. Expansion included addition of teleconference centers in Barrow, Kotzebue, Kodiak, Soldotna and Sitka in 1979.

=====

REGIONAL FACILITIES

ANCHORAGE LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION OFFICE 1972

Established by the Seventh State Legislature in 1972.
Included as initial teleconference center under LR 93, 1978.

FAIRBANKS LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION OFFICE 1975

Established by the Ninth State Legislature in 1975.

Included as initial teleconference site under LR 93, 1978.

KETCHIKAN LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION OFFICE (SESSION-ONLY) January, 1978

Legislative Council minutes, 6-17-77: "Mr. Charney noted there was evidence that the House Finance Committee had approved an in-session information office for Ketchikan and approved \$8,000 for that purpose. The FCC kept the intent, but failed to provide the funds. Motion by Ray that project be carried forward within the limitations of the session funds." FY 79

Explanation of LAA/budget during 1-7-78 Council meeting notes inclusion of funds for Ketchikan office that it was "authorized for 1978 but not funded."

Included as initial teleconference site under LR 93, 1978. Information Officer hired 12-4-77.

NOME LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION OFFICE July 1, 1979

Teleconference center established under LR 93, 1978.

Legislative Council approved \$22,500 from Council contingency funds to establish session-only office, at request of Sen. Ferguson, 12-6-78.

LAA's FY 80 budget included funds for a year-round office (per 5-15-79 review of Agency's budget before Legislative Council).

On-call moderator hired 1-15-79; status changed to full-time Information Officer when full-time Nome LIO opened 7-1-79.

BETHEL LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION OFFICE July 6, 1979

Teleconference Center established in 1978 under LR 93.

Information Officer hired 7-6-79; Bethel LIO opened for business 7-6-79.

DILLINGHAM LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION OFFICE August 6, 1979

Information Officer hired 7-25-79; Dillingham LIO opened 8-6-79.

LAA's FY 80 budget included funds for year-round office.

KENAI PENINSULA LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION OFFICE September 7, 1979

Teleconference center established by CH 161 SLA 78.

LAA's FY 80 budget included funds for session-only office.

Opened as session-only 9-7-79. On-call moderator hired 1-15-79; became Information office 9-7-79.

Division's FY 81 base budget request increased by \$25,000 full-time Soldotna office by action of Legislative Council 6-2-80.

KOTZEBUE LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION OFFICE

September 24, 1979

Teleconference Center established in 1979 by CH 161 SLA 78.
Information Officer hired when full-time LIO opened 9-24-79.
LAA's FY 80 budget included funds for full-time office.

VALDEZ TELECONFERENCE CENTER

October 10, 1979

Cost figures for various configuration prepared at request of Representative Branson 7-12-79.
Legislative Council approved \$6,172 for establishment of teleconference center 10-10-79, from balance of uncommitted funds previously appropriated for the Agency's Research Services Division.
Cost figures for upgrade provided to Representative Cato 2-81. \$85,300 authorized by Sec. 80, CH 101 SLA 1982 to operate Valdez as part-time LIO during FY 83.

KODIAK LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION OFFICE

December 15, 1979

Teleconference Center established by CH 161 SLA 78.
Opened as session only 12-15-79.
Cost figures to upgrade to full-time provided at request of Representative Zharoff 1-25-79.
\$25,000 included in CH 50 SLA 80 to upgrade Kodiak from session-only to full-time.
LAA's FY 80 budget included funds for session-only office.

SITKA LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION OFFICE

December 17, 1979

Teleconference Center established by CH 161 SLA 1979.
Session-only office opened 12-17-79; information officer Charles Bickenheuser originally hired as on-call moderator 2-26-79.
Cost figures to upgrade to full-time prepared at request of Representative Eliason 4-15-80. Rep. Eliason requested at 4-18-80 meeting of the Council that upgrade funds be included as an addendum to the Division's FY 81 budget.
LAA's FY 80 budget included funds for session-only office.
Division's FY 81 base budget request increased by \$25,000 for full-time Sitka office by action of Legislative Council 6-2-80.

MATANU-SUSITNA LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION OFFICE

January 28, 1980

Cost figures for teleconference center prepared at request of Senator Kerttula 11-5-79.
Cost figures for various configurations prepared at request of Representative Meekins 1-3-80.
Cost figures of "modified" information office (no data equipment) prepared at request of Representative Meekins' staff 1-20-80.
News clip dated 1-29-80: "...Carney has obtained a commitment from the Legislature to establish an information office in Wasilla."
\$34,000 included in CH 50 SLA 80 to cover establishment of Mat-Su facility and operation through FY 80.
Cost figures of upgrading to full-time prepared at the request of Representative Carney and provided to Representative Carney and Senator Kerttula 4-3-80.

Division's FY 81 base budget request increased by \$80,000 for full-time Mat-Su office by action of Legislative Council 6-2-80.

CRT equipment installed late June 1980; BASIS October 1980. Information Officer hired 1-28-80; office opened 1-28-80.

BARROW LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION OFFICE May 1, 1980

Teleconference center established by CH 161 SLA 78, Sec. 7. Information Officer hired 4-7-80. Barrow LIO opened 5-1-80.

HAINES TELECONFERENCE CENTER June 19, 1980

Cost figures prepared at request of Senator Ray 4-8-80. \$21,100 included in CH 50 SLA 80 to cover establishment and operation through FY 80. Teleconference drop active 6-19-80. Moderator hired 10-15-80.

HOMER TELECONFERENCE CENTER July 21, 1980

Cost figures prepared at request of Representative Malone 2-8-80. \$14,000 included in CH 50 SLA 80 to cover establishment of Homer and Seward teleconference centers and operation through FY 80. Teleconference drop active 7-21-80. Moderator hired, 4-29-80. At request of Rep. Malone, \$3,500 authorized by Legislative Council 3-16-81, to rent and furnish space.

SEWARD TELECONFERENCE CENTER September 8, 1980

Cost figures prepared at request of Representative Malone 2-8-80. \$14,000 included in CH 50 SLA 80 to cover establishment of Homer and Seward facilities and operation through FY 80. Moderator hired 8-27-80; news release on facility opening dated 9-8-80. \$13,510 included in CH 50 SLA 80 to cover establishment and operation through FY 80.

SAND POINT TELECONFERENCE CENTER Spring, 1981

Cost figures prepared at request of Representative Osterback 2-7-80. \$13,510 included in CH 50 SLA 80 to cover establishment and operation through FY 80.

DELTA JUNCTION LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION OFFICE January 26, 1981

Cost figures prepared at request of Representative Pappy Moss 10-9-80. Legislative Council approved \$20,000 "for establishment of a teleconference/information office" 1-10-81. Moderator hired 1-14-81; office opened 1-26-81.

PETERSBURG TELECONFERENCE CENTER March, 1981

At request of Representative Haugen, \$3,000 authorized by Legislative Council 3-16-81 for operation as off-net teleconference site for balance of FY 81. Moderator hired 3-19-81. First usage - constituent meeting 3-23-81.

Cost figures for upgrade to session-only LIO prepared at the request of Senators Ziegler and Eliason 12-2-82. \$30,000 from session funds authorized by Council 12-8-82 for operation as session-only LIO for the balance of FY 83. Dial-up data pilot.

WRANGELL TELECONFERENCE CENTER

March, 1981

At request of Representative Haugen, \$3,100 authorized by Legislative Council 3-16-81 for operation as off-net teleconference site for balance of FY 81. Moderator hired 3-19-81. First usage - constituent meeting 3-23-81.

CORDOVA TELECONFERENCE CENTER

July, 1982

\$22,500 authorized by Sec. 80 CH 101 SLA 1982 to establish and operate Teleconference Center during FY 83.

AMBLER, ANAKTUVUK PASS, FORT YUKON, GALENA, GAMBELL, HOONAH, HOOPER BAY, KAKTOVIK, NOORVIK, PT. HOPE, ST. PAUL, SAVOONGA, SELAWIK, SHISHMAREF, UNALASKA, UNALAKLEET, WAINWRIGHT AND YAKUTAT TELECONFERENCE CENTERS

July, 1982

\$741,300 authorized by Sec. 173 CH 141 SLA 1982 to establish, operate and provide administrative support for teleconference centers during FY 83. At request of Senator Eliason, Legislative Council approved substitution of Hoonah for Kake 10-1-82. At request of Senator Ferguson, Legislative Council approved deletion of ANS/Anchorage and addition of Ambler and Selawik 12-8-82. Original funding had been adequate to provide for dial-up data on a pilot reduced to three - Fort Yukon, Unalakleet, Unalaska. Overall funding adequate for centers to maintain minimal regular "office hours" for provision of limited information services.

Notes: Information prior to the establishment of the Division of Public Services (5-15-79) is not maintained in the Division files. The FY 80 budget for public information services was prepared and presented by the Division of Administrative Services. The first budget written under the Division of Public Services was the FY 81 budget.

At the end of 1979, the Division was operating 13 sites Anchorage, Barrow, Bethel, Dillingham, Fairbanks, Juneau, Kenai Peninsula, Ketchikan, Kodiak, Kotzebue, Nome, Sitka and Valdez.

Five sites were added in 1980 - Haines, Homer, Mat-Su, Sand Point and Seward. Three sites were added in 1981 - Delta Junction, Petersburg and Wrangell. Nineteen sites were added in 1982 - Ambler, Anaktuvuk Pass, Cordova, Fort Yukon, Galena, Gambell, Hoonah, Hooper Bay, Kaktovik, Noorvik, Point Hope, St. Paul, Savoonga, Selawik, Shishmaref, Unalaska, Unalakleet, Wainwright and Yakutat.

At the end of 1982, the Division was operating 40 sites - 13 full-time LIO's, 3 part-time or session-only LIO's, and 24 teleconference centers.

Routine procedure has been that new facilities are created by legislative initiative. Once a facility has been initially funded, it is carried ahead in the Division's budget as originally established; upgrades also are dependent on legislative initiative. The Division of Public Services budgets to maintain a facility at the level established by the Legislature.

References:

LR 93 1977

CH 161 SLA 78 e.d. 10-10-78

CH 50 SLA 80 e.d. 5-31-80

CH 101 SLA 1982

CH 141 SLA 1982

Legislative Council Minutes

H I S T O R Y

ESTABLISHMENT OF ALASKA'S
LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION FACILITIES

DIVISION OF PUBLIC SERVICES May 15, 1979

Establishment of the Division of Public Services was approved by Legislative Council May 15, 1979.

Funds for operation of the Division were transferred from the Division of Administrative Services and session funds.

Appointment of Director approved May 15, 1979.

JUNEAU INFORMATION CENTER/LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION NETWORK May, 1979

Juneau Information Center/Legislative Information Network were established with the transfer of services to the Division of Public Services.

Legislative Information Network (LIN) staffperson hired May 18, 1979.

Prior to transfer of the Juneau information facility, information support services were provided to regional facilities under the auspices of the Division of Administrative Services, Legislative Affairs Agency.

LEGISLATIVE TELECONFERENCE NETWORK February 2, 1978

LR 93, 1977, directed establishment of a Legislative Teleconference Network (LTN) to be operational in January, 1978, and to include Anchorage, Bethel, Fairbanks, Ketchikan, Juneau, and Nome. The LTN was operational February 2, 1978.

CH 161, SLA 78, Sec. 7 funded expansion and maintenance of the LTN. Expansion included addition of teleconference centers in Barrow, Kotzebue, Kodiak, Soldotna and Sitka in 1979.

=====

REGIONAL FACILITIES

ANCHORAGE LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION OFFICE 1972

Established by the Seventh State Legislature in 1972.
Included as initial teleconference center under LR 93, 1978.

FAIRBANKS LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION OFFICE 1975

Established by the Ninth State Legislature in 1975.

Included as initial teleconference site under LR 93, 1978.

KETCHIKAN LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION OFFICE (SESSION-ONLY) January, 1978

Legislative Council minutes, 6-17-77: "Mr. Charney noted there was evidence that the House Finance Committee had approved an in-session information office for Ketchikan and approved \$8,000 for that purpose. The FCC kept the intent, but failed to provide the funds. Motion by Ray that project be carried forward within the limitations of the session funds." FY 79

Explanation of LAA/budget during 1-7-78 Council meeting notes inclusion of funds for Ketchikan office that it was "authorized for 1978 but not funded."

Included as initial teleconference site under LR 93, 1978. Information Officer hired 12-4-77.

NOME LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION OFFICE July 1, 1979

Teleconference center established under LR 93, 1978.
Legislative Council approved \$22,500 from Council contingency funds to establish session-only office, at request of Sen. Ferguson, 12-6-78.

LAA's FY 80 budget included funds for a year-round office (per 5-15-79 review of Agency's budget before Legislative Council).

On-call moderator hired 1-15-79; status changed to full-time Information Officer when full-time Nome LIO opened 7-1-79.

BETHEL LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION OFFICE July 6, 1979

Teleconference Center established in 1978 under LR 93.
Information Officer hired 7-6-79; Bethel LIO opened for business 7-6-79.

DILLINGHAM LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION OFFICE August 6, 1979

Information Officer hired 7-25-79; Dillingham LIO opened 8-6-79.

LAA's FY 80 budget included funds for year-round office.

KENAI PENINSULA LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION OFFICE September 7, 1979

Teleconference center established by CH 161 SLA 78.
LAA's FY 80 budget included funds for session-only office.

Opened as session-only 9-7-79. On-call moderator hired 1-15-79; became Information Office 9-7-79.

- Division's FY 81 base budget request increased by \$25,000 full-time Soldotna office by action of Legislative Council 6-2-80.

KOTZEBUE LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION OFFICE

September 24, 1979

Teleconference Center established in 1979 by CH 161 SLA 78.
Information Officer hired when full-time LIO opened 9-24-79.
LAA's FY 80 budget included funds for full-time office.

VALDEZ TELECONFERENCE CENTER

October 10, 1979

Cost figures for various configuration prepared at request of Representative Branson 7-12-79.
Legislative Council approved \$6,172 for establishment of teleconference center 10-10-79, from balance of uncommitted funds previously appropriated for the Agency's Research Services Division.
Cost figures for upgrade provided to Representative Cato 2-81.
\$85,300 authorized by Sec. 80, CH 101 SLA 1932 to operate Valdez as part-time LIO during FY 83.

KODIAK LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION OFFICE

December 15, 1979

Teleconference Center established by CH 161 SLA 78.
Opened as session only 12-15-79.
Cost figures to upgrade to full-time provided at request of Representative Zharoff 1-25-79.
\$25,000 included in CH 50 SLA 80 to upgrade Kodiak from session-only to full-time.
LAA's FY 80 budget included funds for session-only office.

SITKA LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION OFFICE

December 17, 1979

Teleconference Center established by CH 161 SLA 1979.
Session-only office opened 12-17-79; information officer Charles Bickenheuser originally hired as on-call moderator 2-26-79.
Cost figures to upgrade to full-time prepared at request of Representative Eliason 4-15-80. Rep. Eliason requested at 4-18-80 meeting of the Council that upgrade funds be included as an addendum to the Division's FY 81 budget.
LAA's FY 80 budget included funds for session-only office.
Division's FY 81 base budget request increased by \$25,000 for full-time Sitka office by action of Legislative Council 6-2-80.

MATANUSKA-SUSITNA LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION OFFICE

January 28, 1980

Cost figures for teleconference center prepared at request of Senator Kerttula 11-5-79.
Cost figures for various configurations prepared at request of Representative Meekins 1-3-80.
Cost figures of "modified" information office (no data equipment) prepared at request of Representative Meekins' staff 1-20-80.
News clip dated 1-29-80: "...Carney has obtained a commitment from the Legislature to establish an information office in Wasilla."
\$34,000 included in CH 50 SLA 80 to cover establishment of Mat-Su facility and operation through FY 80.
• Cost figures of upgrading to full-time prepared at the request of Representative Carney and provided to Representative Carney and Senator Kerttula 4-3-80.

Division's FY 81 base budget request increased by \$80,000 for full-time Mat-Su office by action of Legislative Council 6-2-80.

CRT equipment installed late June 1980; BASIS October 1980. Information Officer hired 1-28-80; office opened 1-28-80.

BARROW LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION OFFICE May 1, 1980

Teleconference center established by CH 161 SLA 78, Sec. 7.
Information Officer hired 4-7-80. Barrow LIO opened 5-1-80.

HAINES TELECONFERENCE CENTER June 19, 1980

Cost figures prepared at request of Senator Ray 4-8-80.
\$21,100 included in CH 50 SLA 80 to cover establishment and operation through FY 80.
Teleconference drop active 6-19-80.
Moderator hired 10-15-80.

HOMER TELECONFERENCE CENTER July 21, 1980

Cost figures prepared at request of Representative Malone 2-8-80.
\$14,000 included in CH 50 SLA 80 to cover establishment of Homer and Seward teleconference centers and operation through FY 80.
Teleconference drop active 7-21-80. Moderator hired, 4-29-80.
At request of Rep. Malone, \$3,500 authorized by Legislative Council 3-16-81, to rent and furnish space.

SEWARD TELECONFERENCE CENTER September 8, 1980

Cost figures prepared at request of Representative Malone 2-8-80.
\$14,000 included in CH 50 SLA 80 to cover establishment of Homer and Seward facilities and operation through FY 80.
Moderator hired 8-27-80; news release on facility opening dated 9-8-80.
\$13,510 included in CH 50 SLA 80 to cover establishment and operation through FY 80.

SAND POINT TELECONFERENCE CENTER Spring, 1981

Cost figures prepared at request of Representative Osterback 2-7-80. \$13,510 included in CH 50 SLA 80 to cover establishment and operation through FY 80.

DELTA JUNCTION LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION OFFICE January 26, 1981

Cost figures prepared at request of Representative Pappy Moss 10-9-80.
Legislative Council approved \$20,000 "for establishment of a teleconference/information office" 1-10-81. Moderator hired 1-14-81; office opened 1-26-81.

PETERSBURG TELECONFERENCE CENTER March, 1981

At request of Representative Haugen, \$3,000 authorized by Legislative Council 3-16-81 for operation as off-net teleconference site for balance of FY 81. Moderator hired 3-19-81. First usage - constituent meeting 3-23-81.

Cost figures for upgrade to session-only LIO prepared at the request of Senators Ziegler and Eliason 12-2-82. \$30,000 from session funds authorized by Council 12-8-82 for operation as session-only LIO for the balance of FY 83. Dial-up data pilot.

WRANGELL TELECONFERENCE CENTER

March, 1981

At request of Representative Haugen, \$3,100 authorized by Legislative Council 3-16-81 for operation as off-net teleconference site for balance of FY 81. Moderator hired 3-19-81. First usage - constituent meeting 3-23-81.

CORDOVA TELECONFERENCE CENTER

July, 1982

\$22,500 authorized by Sec. 80 CH 101 SLA 1982 to establish and operate Teleconference Center during FY 83.

AMBLER, ANAKTUVUK PASS, FORT YUKON, GALENA, GAMBELL, HOONAH, HOOPER BAY, KAKTOVIK, NOORVIK, PT. HOPE, ST. PAUL, SAVOONGA, SELAWIK, SHISHMAREF, UNALASKA, UNALAKLEET, WAINWRIGHT AND YAKUTAT TELECONFERENCE CENTERS

July, 1982

\$741,300 authorized by Sec. 173 CH 141 SLA 1982 to establish, operate and provide administrative support for teleconference centers during FY 83. At request of Senator Eliason, Legislative Council approved substitution of Hoonah for Kake 10-1-82. At request of Senator Ferguson, Legislative Council approved deletion of ANS/Anchorage and addition of Ambler and Selawik 12-8-82. Original funding had been adequate to provide for dial-up data on a pilot reduced to three - Fort Yukon, Unalakleet, Unalaska. Overall funding adequate for centers to maintain minimal regular "office hours" for provision of limited information services.

Notes: Information prior to the establishment of the Division of Public Services (5-15-79) is not maintained in the Division files. The FY 80 budget for public information services was prepared and presented by the Division of Administrative Services. The first budget written under the Division of Public Services was the FY 81 budget.

At the end of 1979, the Division was operating 13 sites Anchorage, Barrow, Bethel, Dillingham, Fairbanks, Juneau, Kenai Peninsula, Ketchikan, Kodiak, Kotzebue, Nome, Sitka and Valdez.

Five sites were added in 1980 - Haines, Homer, Mat-Su, Sand Point and Seward. Three sites were added in 1981 - Delta Junction, Petersburg and Wrangell. Nineteen sites were added in 1982 - Ambler, Anaktuvuk Pass, Cordova, Fort Yukon, Galena, Gambell, Hoonah, Hooper Bay, Kaktovik, Noorvik, Point Hope, St. Paul, Savoonga, Selawik, Shishmaref, Unalaska, Unalakleet, Wainwright and Yakutat.

At the end of 1982, the Division was operating 40 sites - 13 full-time LIO's, 3 part-time or session-only LIO's, and 24 teleconference centers.

Routine procedure has been that new facilities are created by legislative initiative. Once a facility has been initially funded, it is carried ahead in the Division's budget as originally established; upgrades also are dependent on legislative initiative. The Division of Public Services budgets to maintain a facility at the level established by the Legislature.

References:

LR 93 1977	CH 101 SLA 1982
CH 161 SLA 78 e.d. 10-10-78	CH 141 SLA 1982
CH 50 SLA 80 e.d. 5-31-80	Legislative Council Minutes

STATE OF ALASKA
THE LEGISLATURE

POUCH Y - STATE CAPITOL
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99811
907-465-3800


LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS AGENCY

MEMORANDUM

March 11, 1983

SUBJECT: Dedication of liquor tax receipts to alcohol
rehabilitation programs
(Work Order No. 13-1017)

TO: Representative Mitchell E. Abood, Jr.
Chairman, House State Affairs Committee

FROM:  Russ Josephson
Legislative Counsel

You have asked whether liquor tax receipts may be retained in the communities where they are collected and be used there for funding alcohol rehabilitation programs.

The "earmarking" of revenues in this way creates a dedicated fund. Under the Alaska Constitution, Article IX, section 7, as interpreted by the Alaska Supreme Court in State v. Alex, 646 P.2d 203 (Alaska 1982), the prohibition against dedicated funds extends to all sources of public revenues and not just "proceeds of any state tax or license". The attorney general recently rendered an opinion (Op. Atty. Gen. File Nos. J66-785-81 and J66-649-80) clarifying what the Supreme Court holding might be with regard to several specific funds and accounts and declared that certain exceptions might be implied by the Alaska Supreme Court. However, none of those implied exceptions includes liquor tax receipts. Therefore, liquor tax receipts may not be dedicated constitutionally and the question of retention of liquor tax receipts in the communities where they are collected need not be addressed here.

Although a dedicated fund is prohibited constitutionally, there is another way to assure that there is a relationship between the liquor tax and the alcohol rehabilitation programs. The same attorney general's opinion mentioned above outlines a method of appropriating in this type of situation that ensures effective legislative control over state finances while providing for budgeting flexibility for programs like this with needs that are unpredictable. That

Representative Mitchell E. Abood, Jr.
Page 2
March 11, 1983

method involves an appropriation to a separate fund in an amount to be ascertained by reference to receipts from a specified source (e.g., liquor tax receipts) during a definite period (annually or for the two fiscal years over which the present legislature has control).

RJ:ljb
1/034

Liquor Tax
(increasing)

HOUSE BILL NO. 202, by Reps. Adams and Liska. Would increase the state liquor tax in the following manner: malt beverages from 25 cents a gallon to 32-1/2 cents a gallon; wine or

page 180

other beverages of 21 percent alcohol by volume or less from 60 cents a gallon to \$1 a gallon; other beverages having a content of more than 21 percent alcohol by volume from \$4 a gallon to \$5.75 a gallon. Changes wording in AS 43.60 from "intoxicating liquors" to "alcoholic beverages". Provides the increase takes effect on the first day of the month after the month in which the law takes effect. Provides Act takes effect immediately.

Introduced February 15 and referred to State Affairs, then to Finance.

STATEMENT BY W.L. KUBLEY

STATE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
MARCH 9, 1983

- o ALASKA DOES NOT NEED THE REVENUE THAT WOULD BE GENERATED FROM AN INCREASE IN THE EXCISE TAX ON SPIRITS BECAUSE WE HAVE SURPLUS IN OUR STATE BUDGET. OUR PRESENT TAX RATE IS THE FOURTH HIGHEST AMONG ALL LICENSE STATES, 44% ABOVE THE NATIONAL AVERAGE, WITH TAXES ACCOUNTING FOR 29% OF THE TYPICAL RETAIL BOTTLE PRICE OF SPIRITS.
- o THE ALCOHOL BEVERAGE INDUSTRY YIELDED \$9 MILLION TO THE ALASKA TREASURY (EXCLUDING LOCAL TAXES) IN 1981, 56.9% FROM SPIRITS ALONE.
- o THE FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT OF 2,888 PERSONS WERE EMPLOYED BY ALASKA'S BEVERAGE ALCOHOL INDUSTRY IN 1980.
- o THE BEVERAGE ALCOHOL INDUSTRY CONTRIBUTES \$50 MILLION IN PAYROLL AND PROFITS, AND \$269 MILLION IN RETAIL SALES TO THE ALASKA ECONOMY.

MR. CHAIRMAN, I WAS A MEMBER OF THIS BODY IN 1961 WHEN THE LEGISLATURE VOTED TO INCREASE ALL EXCISE TAXES. WE NEEDED THESE INCREASES TO FUND OUR ENORMOUS BUDGET OF 55,734,040. I DON'T THINK WE NEED THIS INCREASE NOW TO HELP OUR BUDGET. SINCE THAT TIME, WE HAVE REPEALED THE INCOME TAX AND THERE ARE NOW BILLS IN YOUR COMMITTEES TO DECREASE THE MOTOR FUEL TAX BY 5 CENTS A GALLON, TO REPEAL THE MOTOR AND MARINE FUEL TAX, SO WHY INCREASE THIS EXCISE TAX?

MR. CHAIRMAN, H.B. 202 IS A PUNITIVE TAX BILL. I KNOW THE REASON HAS AND WILL BE GIVEN THAT IT IS TO HELP THE TREATMENT AND CUT DOWN ON ALCOHOLISM. THEN WHY NOT RAISE THE MOTOR AND MARINE FUEL TAX TO HELP OUR OVERCROWDED AND REPAIR-NEEDED HIGHWAYS AND BOAT HARBORS - AS I SAID, IT IS A PUNITIVE TAX AND NOT NEEDED.

YES, I KNOW ALASKA HAS A PROBLEM WITH ALCOHOLISM - AS DO ALL OTHER STATES - IT IS A DISEASE AND NEEDS A CURE. WHOLESALERS AND RETAILERS HAVE A FULL-TIME TEAM WORKING ON THIS PROBLEM. YOU HAVE PROBABLY HEARD ABOUT AND READ THE MANY FAVORABLE ARTICLES AND EDITORIALS ABOUT THE LIQUOR INDUSTRY GETTING WITH THE PROGRAM. THERE IS THE "KNOW YOUR LIMIT" AND THE ABBEY PROGRAM, WHICH YOU WILL HEAR MORE ABOUT FROM OTHER WITNESSES WHO WILL BE BEFORE YOU.

THE LEGISLATORS BEFORE YOU, IN A FEW SHORT YEARS, HAVE INCREASED THE APPROPRIATION FROM 4 TO 15 MILLIONS OF DOLLARS TO THE ALCOHOLISM PROGRAM. IF ALCOHOLISM IS GROWING, I THINK YOU SHOULD LOOK AT THEIR PROGRAMS.

FIGURES VARY ON THE NUMBER OF ALCOHOLICS IN ALASKA FROM 5 TO 10%. WHAT ABOUT THE OTHER 90 TO 95% OF PEOPLE - THE MANY WHO ENJOY HAVING A DRINK, GOING TO SOMEONE'S HOME, ENTERTAINING IN THEIR HOME, GOING OUT FOR AN EVENING OF DINING AND DANCING? THE LARGE PERCENTAGE WHO DO NOT HAVE A PROBLEM WILL HAVE TO PAY THE BILL, AS IN ALL TAX INCREASES THE CONSUMER ENDS UP PAYING THE INCREASE.

- THE DISTILLED SPIRITS INDUSTRY IS NOT RECESSION PROOF. THE INDUSTRY HAS BEEN EXPERIENCING DECLINING SALES BECAUSE OF THE RECESSION AND COMPETITION FROM ALCOHOL BEVERAGES THAT HAVE MUCH LOWER TAXES AND THEREFORE COMPARATIVELY LOWER PRICES.
- SPIRIT CONSUMPTION IN ALASKA DECLINED 1.4 PERCENT IN THE FIRST NINE MONTHS OF 1982 COMPARED WITH THE SAME PERIOD OF 1981. INCREASED TAXES WILL CONTRIBUTE TO FURTHER DECLINES OF CONSUMPTION AND REDUCE THE VOLUME SUBJECT TO TAXATION AND THEREFORE REDUCE REVENUES.
- ALASKA EXPECTS A SUBSTANTIAL BUDGET SURPLUS AGAIN IN 1984 AND PROBABLY 1985. REVENUES ARE MORE THAN AMPLE WITHOUT A NEW TAX ON SPIRITS.
- THE BEVERAGE ALCOHOL INDUSTRY IN ALASKA PROVIDES AN ESTIMATED 2,888 FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT JOBS. ALCOHOL BEVERAGE LICENSES ISSUED IN 1980 NUMBERED 1,210 BEING INDICATIVE OF THE NUMBER OF LICENSED FIRMS DEPENDING ON ALCOHOL BEVERAGES FOR A LIVELIHOOD. THERE WERE 440 OFF-PREMISE OUTLETS AND 750 RESTAURANTS, BARS, AND OTHER RETAILERS OF SPIRITS, BEER AND WINE.
- THE ALASKAN SPIRITS INDUSTRY IS MADE UP OF MANY SMALL BUSINESSES WHICH COULD BE HURT BY TAX INCREASES, ESPECIALLY DURING THE CURRENT RECESSION. OVER 47 PERCENT OF DRINKING ESTABLISHMENTS HAVE ONLY 1-4 EMPLOYEES;

APPROXIMATELY 71 PERCENT OF LIQUOR STORES HAVE ONLY 1-4 EMPLOYEES.

- o INCREASED TAXATION OF SPIRITS WOULD INCREASE THE DIFFICULTIES FACED BY THESE ESTABLISHMENTS AND EMPLOYEES IN THE CURRENT RECESSION. THEY ARE VERY SENSITIVE TO CHANGES OF PROFITABILITY AND LOSSES AND COULD BE FORCED OUT OF BUSINESS BY HIGHER TAXES. HIGHER TAXES COULD CAUSE UNEMPLOYMENT IN THE INDUSTRY AND ADD TO THE ALREADY HIGH OVERALL UNEMPLOYMENT RATE OF 12.3 PERCENT IN ALASKA.
- o THE ALCOHOL ABUSER IS LEAST LIKELY TO REDUCE CONSUMPTION BECAUSE OF PRICE INCREASES. ALCOHOLISM IS AN ILLNESS AND THE COST OF ALCOHOL DOES NOT DETER CONSUMPTION BY THE ALCOHOLIC. ON THE CONTRARY, HEALTH EXPERTS AGREE THAT INCREASING THE PRICE OF BEVERAGE ALCOHOL ADDS TO THE PROBLEMS OF ALCOHOLICS WITHOUT DOING ANYTHING ABOUT THEIR ILLNESS.
- o DR. MORRIS E. CHAFETZ, A LEADING EXPERT ON ALCOHOLISM AND FORMER DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON ALCOHOL ABUSE AND ALCOHOLISM, HAS NOTED THAT HIGHER EXCISE TAXES WILL REDUCE DRINKING AMONG PEOPLE "WHO CAN TAKE ALCOHOL OR LEAVE IT ... LEAVING UNHEALTHY DRINKING AS THE CHIEF ROLE MODEL FOR THE YOUNG."
- o USE OF THE TAXING POWER OF THE STATE TO IMPOSE SECTARIAN MORAL STANDARDS OF ONE SECTION OF THE COMMUNITY ON OTHER SECTIONS IS INAPPROPRIATE IN OUR DEMOCRATIC FORM OF

GOVERNMENT. THE INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH ON THE ECONOMICS OF TAXATION STATES, "THE TAX CODE IS HARDLY A PLACE TO DICTATE MORALITY OR PERSONAL TASTES TO THE AMERICAN POPULACE." PROPOSALS TO RAISE TAXES ON SPIRITS OFTEN HAVE SUCH OBJECTIVES.

CONSEQUENTLY, WHILE THE TAX WILL CURTAIL CONSUMPTION BY INDIVIDUALS WHO DRINK RESPONSIBLY, THE INCREASED TAX WILL HAVE LITTLE OR NO EFFECT ON CONSUMPTION AMONG THOSE WHO ABUSE ALCOHOL, ALTHOUGH THEY MAY SHIFT TO LESS EXPENSIVE (AND IN SOME CASES LESS PURE) FORMS OF ALCOHOL. INDEED, THE STATE MIGHT EVEN MISLEAD CONSUMERS WHO, SEEING THAT SPIRITS ARE TAXED FAR HEAVIER PER SERVING THAN BEER OR WINE, CONCLUDE INCORRECTLY THAT THE ALCOHOL CONTENT IS GREATER IN A COCKTAIL THAN A CAN OF BEER OR GLASS OF WINE. MAJOR SPIRITS PRICE INCREASES WILL INCREASE AN ALREADY EXISTING SHIFT TOWARD BEER AND WINE CONSUMPTION, WHICH HAS GROWN BY 20% AND 30%, RESPECTIVELY, COMPARED TO SPIRITS CONSUMPTION GROWTH OF 6 PERCENT BETWEEN 1975 AND 1980.

NOR SHOULD ANYONE DELUDE HIMSELF BY THINKING THAT INCREASING THE EXCISE TAX WILL CURE THE ALCOHOLIC. FOR THOSE WHO SUFFER FROM THE ILLNESS OF ALCOHOLISM, RATIONAL DECISION MAKING ASSUMED IN TRADITIONAL ECONOMIC THEORY HAS NO APPLICABILITY. THE PROBLEM DRINKER SIMPLY WILL HAVE TO FIND ADDITIONAL MONEY TO PAY THE INCREASED COST OF THE PRODUCT.

NOR IS THERE ANY EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT THE CONTENTION THAT SPIRITS IS THE DRINK OF THE RICH AND THEREFORE THAT INCREASES IN SPIRITS TAXES WILL BE BORNE PRIMARILY BY THOSE BETTER ABLE TO PAY. INDEED, A RECENT STUDY HAS SHOWN THAT ROUGHLY HALF OF THOSE WHO USE DISTILLED SPIRITS HAVE INCOMES OF \$10,000-\$20,000 AND LESS THAN \$10,000. FURTHER, USE OF SPIRITS IS AS PREVALENT AMONG LOWER-INCOME GROUPS AS IS USE OF BEER; BOTH THE WORKING CLASS AND HIGH-INCOME WORKERS USE SPIRITS. CONSEQUENTLY, SPIRITS TAX INCREASES WILL BE FELT BY BOTH HIGH-INCOME AND LOW-INCOME FAMILIES. HOWEVER, IT IS THE LOWER-INCOME WORKERS WHO WILL BE LESS ABLE TO PAY FOR THE INCREASED COST OF THE BEVERAGE OF CHOICE.

THE BEVERAGE ALCOHOL INDUSTRY IS NOT ASKING FOR A SPECIAL FAVOR OR A TAX BREAK. WE ARE ASKING FOR A FAIR, EQUITABLE TREATMENT. THE DISTILLED SPIRITS INDUSTRY ALREADY FINDS ITSELF IN A SITUATION WHERE AN ASTOUNDING 44 PERCENT OF THE RETAIL PRICE OF OUR PRODUCT IS TAXES, OF WHICH 19 PERCENT ARE STATE AND LOCAL TAXES. SURELY, THIS IS A GREAT ENOUGH BURDEN FOR ANY PRODUCT OR INDUSTRY TO BEAR. THE ALASKAN CONSUMERS WHO USE OUR PRODUCT IN MODERATION ALSO WILL BE DISCRIMINATED AGAINST AND PENALIZED BY FURTHER STATE TAX INCREASES. PRICES COULD GO UP SIGNIFICANTLY AND HIT LOW AND MIDDLE INCOME FAMILIES IN A MOST REGRESSIVE FASHION.

SOME HAVE THOUGHT TO DEFEND TAXING THE BEVERAGE ALCOHOL INDUSTRY IN TERMS OF MAKING "SIN" EXPENSIVE. YET IT IS NOT SOUND PUBLIC POLICY TO USE THE TAX CODE IN THIS MANNER. THE INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH ON THE ECONOMICS OF TAXATION STUDY

MAKES THIS POINT BY NOTING "... THE TAX CODE IS HARDLY A PLACE TO DICTATE MORALITY OR PERSONAL TASTES TO THE AMERICAN POPULACE." MANY ALASKANS USE BEVERAGE ALCOHOL RESPONSIBLY AND THEY SHOULD NOT BE PENALIZED FOR THE ENJOYMENT THEY DERIVE FROM DRINKING THEIR FAVORITE BEVERAGE IN A VAIN ATTEMPT TO DISCOURAGE THE PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED WITH ABUSIVE DRINKING.

CONSEQUENTLY, LEGISLATORS AND POLICY MAKERS NEED TO BE AWARE THAT THE TAX CODE CANNOT CURE THE PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED WITH ALCOHOLISM AND ALCOHOL ABUSE; AND THAT THE TAX CODE SHOULD NOT BE USED TO SUPERSEDE THE CRIMINAL CODE NOR DICTATE SOCIAL POLICY AS SOME WOULD LIKE TO CONTEND.

YOU HAVE BEFORE YOU A PACKET SHOWING THE PRESENT TAXES AND INFORMATION SHOWING THAT THE LIQUOR INDUSTRY IS CONCERNED ABOUT ALCOHOLISM AND THE ADVERTISING THEY ARE DOING NATIONALLY TO COMBAT THE PROBLEM.

MR. CHAIRMAN AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS, AS I HAVE STATED BEFORE, THIS IS A PUNITIVE TAX AND IS NOT NEEDED. THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION.

EXCISE TAX RATES ON SPECIFIED ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES
 LEVIED BY 32 LICENSE STATES AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 RANKED ACCORDING TO MAGNITUDE AND BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT¹

January 1983

Distilled Spirits		Table Wine		Dessert Wine		Beer	
State	Rate per Gallon	State	Rate per Gallon	State	Rate per Gallon	State	Rate per Gallon
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Florida	\$4.75	Florida	\$1.75	Georgia	\$2.54	South Carolina	.768
South Carolina	4.59 ²	Georgia	1.51	Florida	2.43	Florida	.400
Minnesota	4.39	Tennessee	1.10 ⁵	South Dakota	1.40	Georgia	.322
Massachusetts	4.05	South Carolina	1.08 ⁵	Nebraska	1.25	Louisiana	.322
Alaska	4.00	South Dakota	.90	Tennessee	1.10 ⁵	Oklahoma	.322
Oklahoma	4.00	Arkansas	.75	South Carolina	1.08 ⁵	South Dakota	.267
Tennessee	4.00	Nebraska	.65	Oklahoma	1.00	Alaska	.250
South Dakota	3.80	Alaska	.60	Minnesota	.79	Arkansas	.234
Georgia	3.79	Massachusetts	.55	Arkansas	.75	Kansas	.180
New York	3.25 ⁶	Kentucky	.50	Kansas	.75	Texas	.165
Wisconsin	3.25	North Dakota	.50	Alaska	.60	North Dakota	.160
New Jersey	2.80	Oklahoma	.50	Illinois	.60	Nebraska	.140
Nebraska	2.75	Indiana	.47	North Dakota	.60	Minnesota	.129
Indiana	2.68	New Mexico	.45	Massachusetts	.55	Tennessee	.126
Arizona	2.50	Arizona	.42	Kentucky	.50	Indiana	.115
Arkansas	2.50	Delaware	.40	Nevada	.50	Massachusetts	.106
Connecticut	2.50	Maryland	.40	Indiana	.47	New Mexico	.090
Kansas	2.50	Rhode Island	.40	Wisconsin	.45	Maryland	.090
Louisiana	2.50	Kansas	.30	New Mexico	.45	Connecticut	.081
North Dakota	2.50	Missouri	.30	Arizona	.42	Kentucky	.081
Rhode Island	2.50	Nevada	.30	Delaware	.40	Arizona	.080
Colorado	2.28	New Jersey	.30	Maryland	.40	Colorado	.080
Delaware	2.25	Colorado	.28	Rhode Island	.40	D.C.	.073
Nevada	2.05	Minnesota	.27	Texas	.34	Illinois	.070
California	2.00	Connecticut	.25	D.C.	.33	Delaware	.065
Illinois	2.00	Wisconsin	.25	Missouri	.30	Rhode Island	.065
Missouri	2.00	Illinois	.23	New Jersey	.30	Wisconsin	.065
Texas	2.00	Texas	.17	Colorado	.28	Missouri	.060
Kentucky	1.92	D.C.	.15	Connecticut	.25	Nevada	.060 ⁶
New Mexico	1.63	Louisiana	.11	Louisiana	.23	New York	.044 ⁶
D.C.	1.50	New York	.10	New York	.10	California	.040
Maryland	1.50	California	.01	California	.02	New Jersey	.033
Median of State Taxes	2.50	Median of State Taxes	.40	Median of State Taxes	.485	Median of State Taxes	.098
Average of State Taxes	2.84	Average of State Taxes	.498	Average of State Taxes	.674	Average of State Taxes	.159
Federal Tax	10.50 ³	Federal Tax	.17	Federal Tax	.67	Federal Tax	.29 ⁴

¹ Hawaii, the only other license state, levies an excise tax on alcoholic beverages of 20 percent of the wholesale price.

² Based on one three-gallon case of spirits and including all "additional" taxes.

³ Per proof gallon

⁴ Actual rate of \$9 per 31 gallon barrel.

⁵ Includes additional tax 18¢/gal.

⁶ New York City has an additional tax \$1.00/gal. on distilled spirits and 12¢/gal. on beer

U.S. PER CAPITA CONSUMPTION
WINE
1981

<u>RANK IN CONSUMPTION</u>	<u>STATE OR DISTRICT</u>	<u>GALLONAGE PER CAPITA</u>
1	District of Columbia	6.94
2	Nevada	4.98
3	California	4.50
4	New Hampshire	3.68
5	Rhode Island	3.33
6	Washington	3.31
7	Alaska	3.27
8	New Jersey	3.17
9	Massachusetts	3.10
10	Oregon	3.09
11	Vermont	3.06
12	New York	3.00
13	Connecticut	2.78
14	Hawaii	2.68
15	Colorado	2.65
16	Arizona	2.55
17	Florida	2.17
18	Maryland	2.18
19	Illinois	2.17
20	Delaware	2.01
21	Montana	1.98
22	Wisconsin	1.94
23	Idaho	1.92
24	Maine	1.88
25	New Mexico	1.87
26	Michigan	1.77
27	Minnesota	1.67
28	Virginia	1.66
29	Louisiana	1.62
30	Texas	1.45
31	Pennsylvania	1.43
32	Wyoming	1.41
33	Ohio	1.34
34	Missouri	1.32
35	North Carolina	1.28
36	Nebraska	1.24
37	Georgia	1.23
38	South Carolina	1.16
39	South Dakota	1.15
40	Alabama	1.12
41	Indiana	1.10
42	North Dakota	1.08
43	Oklahoma	0.95
44	West Virginia	0.84
45	Iowa	0.83
46	Tennessee	0.79
47	Utah	0.78
48	Kansas	0.76
49	Arkansas	0.74
50	Kentucky	0.64
51	Mississippi	0.53

ALL AGES PER CAPITA

Source: Economic Research Department
Wine Institute

U.S. PER CAPITA CONSUMPTION
MALT BEVERAGES
1981

<u>RANK IN CONSUMPTION</u>	<u>STATE OR DISTRICT</u>	<u>GALLONAGE PER CAPITA</u>
1	Nevada	37.1
2	Wisconsin	34.3
3	New Hampshire	33.4
4	Montana	32.8
5	Wyoming	32.0
6	Texas	31.9
7	Arizona	31.3
8	Hawaii	30.2
9	District of Columbia	29.1
10	New Mexico	28.8
11	Colorado	28.6
12	Alaska	28.4
13	Florida	28.3
14	Nebraska	27.7
15	North Dakota	27.0
16	Delaware	26.9
17	Massachusetts	26.7
18	Vermont	26.2
19	California	25.7
20	Pennsylvania	25.6
21	Idaho	25.5
22	Illinois	25.2
23	Louisiana	25.1
24	Iowa	24.9
25	Maryland	24.8
25	Missouri	24.8
27	Rhode Island	24.7
28	Minnesota	24.5
29	Washington	24.4
30	Oregon	24.2
31	Ohio	23.6
32	Michigan	23.2
33	Maine	23.1
34	South Dakota	22.7
35	New York	22.5
36	Indiana	22.4
37	New Jersey	22.2
38	Virginia	21.9
39	Kansas	21.8
40	South Carolina	21.6
41	Oklahoma	20.8
42	Georgia	20.1
42	Mississippi	20.1
42	Tennessee	20.1
45	Kentucky	19.6
46	North Carolina	19.4
47	Connecticut	19.0
48	Arkansas	18.4
48	West Virginia	18.4
50	Alabama	17.5
51	Utah	15.6

Based on 18 years of
age and older

Source: United States Brewers
Association, Inc.

STATE OF ALASKA
PRELIMINARY STATEMENT OF FISCAL IMPACT

RECEIVED
MAR 1 1983

Bill No: HB 202 Date on Bill: 2/15/83
 Title: An act increasing the liquor tax.
 Sponsor: Adams
 Requestor: House State Affairs

1. Estimated fiscal impacts on:

a. Expenditures:

(Thousands of Dollars)

			FY 83	FY 84	FY 85	FY 86		
Capital								
Operating								
Total								

b. Revenues:

Revenue			-0-	2.1 mill	3.9 mill			
---------	--	--	-----	----------	----------	--	--	--

2. Source of funds to offset fiscal impact of bill:

3. Assumptions:

The analysis assumes the new tax rates become effective July 1, 1983.

4. Disclaimer:

This statement has not been reviewed by the OMB in the Office of the Governor. It therefore does not represent the final estimate of fiscal impact.

Prepared By: Mary Belfield Phone: 465-2300
 Division: Comm. Office Date: 2/28/83
 Approved by Commissioner: Robert E. Hart Date: 2/28/83
 Department: Revenue

5. Distribution:

- Original to Legislative Finance
- Copy to OMB
- Copy to Sponsor
- Copy to Requestor

2/15/83

Alaska State Legislature

House of Representatives

Al Adams

Chairman

Committee on Finance

WHILE IN SESSION
Pouch V
State Capitol
Juneau, Alaska 99811
(907) 465-3706

OUT OF SESSION
P.O. Box 333
Juneau, Alaska 99752
(907) 442-3320

2024 W. 6th
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
(907) 274-0615



Official Business

RECEIVED
MAR 4 1983

March 2, 1983

MEMORANDUM

TO: Representative Mitch Abood, Chairman
House State Affairs

FROM: Representative Al Adams *AAA*

SUBJECT: House Bill 202 - Increasing the Liquor Tax

I appreciate your prompt scheduling of House Bill 202 and wanted to take this opportunity to provide you with a few explanatory details.

HB 202 increases the state liquor tax, which has not been raised since 1964, as follows:

- malt beverages from 25¢ per gallon to 32½¢ (a 30% increase amounting to approximately a 4¢ increase per six pack of beer);
- wine from 60¢ to \$1.00 (a 66% increase which will amount to approximately 32¢ per three liter of bottle of wine); and
- hard liquor from \$4.00 per gallon to \$5.75 (a 44% increase amounting to about 23¢ on a half liter of whiskey).

According to the Department of Revenue, the additional taxes generated from this legislation is estimated at \$2,100,000 in FY 84 and \$3,900,000 in FY 85, resulting in total revenues of \$14,600,000 and \$16,900,000 respectively.

General Fund Unrestricted Revenues


In Thousands of Current Dollars

	FY 1982 Actual January	FY 1983 Estimate January	FY 1984 Estimate January	FY 1985 Estimate January
<u>Taxes</u>				
<u>Income</u>				
Corporate-General	34,800	-0-	-0-	-0-
Corporate-Petroleum	668,900	-0-	-0-	-0-
Corporate (1)	-0-	235,000	272,000	295,000
<u>Gross Receipts</u>				
Alaska Business License	5,500	5,800	6,000	6,300
Fish-Canned Salmon	8,600	5,000	5,000	5,000
Fish-Shorebased	8,700	9,000	9,000	9,000
Fish-Floating	5,500	5,500	5,500	5,500
Seafood Marketing (2)	-0-	1,000	1,000	1,000
Salmon Enhancement	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400
Insurance Companies	12,500	14,500	17,000	20,000
Electric and Telephone Co-ops	1,200	1,300	1,300	1,300
Mining License Tax	200	200	200	300
<u>Severance</u>				
Oil & Gas Production(3)(4)	1,581,100	1,528,800	1,197,300	1,219,700
Oil & Gas Conservation	600	800	700	700
<u>Property</u>				
Oil & Gas(5)(6)	142,700	148,600	153,200	158,000
<u>Sale/Use</u>				
Alcoholic Beverages	9,000	12,000	12,500	13,000
Fuel Taxes-Aviation	6,300	5,100	5,400	5,500
Fuel Taxes-Highway	20,300	21,000	22,000	23,000
Fuel Taxes-Marine	3,700	3,800	4,000	4,200
Tobacco Products	1,900	2,000	2,000	2,000
<u>Other</u>				
Estate	300	500	500	500
Total Taxes	<u>2,514,200</u>	<u>2,002,300</u>	<u>1,717,000</u>	<u>1,772,400</u>
<u>Licenses & Permits</u>				
<u>Business</u>	10,800	11,000	12,000	12,500
<u>Non-Business</u>	13,000	13,000	13,500	14,000
Total Licenses & Permits	<u>23,800</u>	<u>24,000</u>	<u>25,500</u>	<u>26,500</u>
<u>Intergovernmental Receipts</u>				
<u>Federal Shared Revenues(7)(8)(9)</u>	<u>21,700</u>	<u>26,600</u>	<u>10,000</u>	<u>10,000</u>
<u>State Resource Revenue</u>				
<u>Sale/Use</u>				
Bonus Sales(7)(10)(11)	5,000	26,100	-0-	-0-
Investment Earnings(12)	324,700	300,000	100,000	100,000
Rents(7)(10)(11)	3,500	4,000	4,000	4,000
Royalties(4)(7)(13)	1,157,300	1,119,400	883,500	912,000
Sale of State Property	5,200	5,500	5,500	5,500
Gravel, Timber, etc.(14)	1,200	5,500	2,000	2,000

Excessive Tax Burden


Alaska

Out of the typical 1982 retail price of \$8.87 for a bottle of distilled spirits in Alaska . . .



28.5%
(\$2.53)
goes to
taxes


750 ml. bottle, 80 proof



*The rates suggested above are approximate and will vary with each individual
KNOW YOUR LIMIT


State and Local Revenues from Alcohol Beverages [Millions of Dollars]

Alcohol beverages are an important revenue source in Alaska.
Of alcohol beverage revenues in Alaska, 56.9% comes from distilled spirits.



1981 State and Local Revenues From Alcohol Beverages Significant




[Alaska]



Alcohol Beverage Industry Contributes:


[To Alaska]

1981	1980	1980	1980
Revenues to State & Local Governments	Jobs	Payrolls & Profits	Retail Sales
\$10 Million	2,888	\$49.9 Million	\$268.5 Million



Distilled Spirits Consumption

1981 Total in the USA




1981 Total in Alaska

1.36 Million Gallons

In Alaska, 44.6% of pure alcohol consumed in spirits
Yet distilled spirits paid 57.1% of state and local revenues
from alcohol beverages in 1980


Pure Alcohol Consumption
by Product

State and Local Tax Collections
by Product



Inequity of Alcohol Beverage Tax

[Alaska]



Revenue from
one cocktail

=

1.7 times the
revenue from one
can of beer

=

2 times the
revenue from one
glass of table wine

Key Points

- o Alaska does not need the revenue that would be generated from an increase in the excise tax on spirits because they have a huge surplus in their state budget. Their present tax rate is the fourth highest among all License states, 44% above the national average, with taxes accounting for 29% of the typical retail bottle price of spirits.
- o The alcohol beverage industry yielded \$10 million to the Alaska treasury (excluding local taxes) in 1981, 56.9% from spirits alone.
- o Spirits sales generate 7 times more revenue than wine sales do even though by volume, spirits sales are only 6% higher than wine sales.
- o The full-time equivalent of 2,888 persons were employed by Alaska's beverage alcohol industry in 1980.
- o The beverage alcohol industry contributes \$50 million in payroll & profits, and \$269 million in retail sales to the Alaska economy.
- o The revenue per gallon of pure alcohol from spirits, \$9.93, is almost twice the amount of revenue per gallon of pure alcohol from wine and 58% greater than that from beer.
- o The Federal government has granted licenses for 13 small fuel-alcohol plants in Alaska; each is capable of producing up to 10,000 proof gallons annually. The potential exists that the alcohol might be diverted to produce illegal, non-taxed spirits.

CONTRIBUTION TO ALASKA TAX REVENUES

Year	Excise Tax Revenues (\$000)		As % of All Excises		Sales Tax & License Fees (\$000)		Total Tax Revenue from (\$000)		As % of Total Tax Revenues	
	All Bev.		All Bev.		All Bev.		All Bev.		All Bev.	
	Spirits	Alcohol	Spirits	Alcohol	Spirits	Alcohol	Spirits	Alcohol	Spirits	Alcohol
1977	5,037	7,909	7.6%	12.0%	489	949	5,526	8,858	0.7%	1.1%
1978	4,735	7,610	6.9	11.1	507	1,006	5,242	8,616	0.9	1.5
1979	4,535	7,443	6.1	10.0	487	1,053	5,022	8,496	0.6	1.0
1980	4,517	7,601	8.3	14.0	462	1,029	4,979	8,630	0.3	0.6
1981	5,025	8,482	9.4	15.9	655	1,494	5,680	9,976	0.2	0.4

ALL BEVERAGE ALCOHOL CONTRIBUTION TO ALASKA ECONOMY

Year	Licenses Issued*	Employment**	Payroll** & Profits (\$000)	Retail Sales (\$000)
1972	1,004	1,506	14,677	82,474
1977	1,149	2,505	32,624	187,364
1978E	1,167	2,518	34,742	198,618
1979E	1,210	2,674	40,292	227,777
1980E	1,210	2,888	49,930	268,510

*Approximates number of establishments. Due to duplication, number of establishments may be less than number of licenses issued. Includes manufacturing, wholesale and retail.

**Includes full-time equivalent employees and payroll at retail.

Sources: Available upon request. E - Estimated.

AABEI Alaska Alcohol Beverage Education Institute

PRESENTATION: ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE 1983

Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Members of this Committee, Ladies and Gentlemen. My name is Ralph W. Kopansky. I represent the Alaska Alcohol Beverage Education Institute. Previously, I held federal appointments for ten years as a consultant to the National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism and the U.S. Public Health Service. I also served as coordinator of education and prevention and acting clinical director of the Regional Center for Alcohol and other Addictions in Fairbanks.

I will limit my remarks to the subject of increasing the control of consumption theory of which excise tax on alcoholic beverages is an objective.

The State Office of Alcohol and Drug Abuse, according to their 1980-81 Alcoholism Plan, and according to a more recent released document prepared by the Division of Legislative Audit entitled

A Special Performance Report On
The Department of Health and
Social Services State Office Of
Alcoholism and Drug Abuse
July 1982 - December 1982

endorses a Public Health Epidemiological Model for dealing with alcohol abuse and alcoholism. One phase of that model is to appropriate funds to promote reduction of alcohol consumption. Increased taxation

AABEI Alaska Alcohol Beverage Education Institute

page - 2

on alcoholic beverages is an example. The rationale presented in support of legislative taxation to reduce consumption is based on a theory that by making alcoholic beverages more expensive fewer people will drink or people will drink less and this will reduce alcohol abuse and alcoholism. The basis of the control of consumption theory was the work of S. Ledermann (1950's) in France. Critics of the Lederman study and subsequent control of consumption theories point to the fact that the theory predicted a relationship in change of alcohol consumption to Homogeneous Populations (never defined in his work). Homogeneous populations do not exist in complex industrial societies including Alaska.

A more recent effort to promote the control of consumption theory was made by W. Schmidt and R. Popham (1978). Their work and other studies rely on two major factors: (1) Apparent beverage alcohol consumption in various societies, and (2) Various health problems, with the greatest emphasis on liver cirrhosis mortality. The control of consumption model is non-sociological and non-cultural. There is no attention paid to drinking customs, attitudes, norms, and behaviors of various cultural groups or sub-populations by age, sex, race, ethnicity, etc. within a mixed or heterogeneous society. Furthermore, the disease concept of alcoholism is never linked to the model, although alcoholism is recognized as a definable clinical disease entity by a large proportion of the medical and scientific community.

AABEI Alaska Alcohol Beverage Education Institute

page - 3 -

Supporters of the control of consumption theory deal with aggregate statistics. They treat populations as a single entity. They fail to account for individual and sub-group differences such as changes in drinking patterns over time. Where "self-reporting" studies are used there are methodological flaws that threaten their reliability and validity.¹ We are far from dealing with an exact or even approaching exact science. Public policy should not be based on highly questionable arguments or a very inexact science.

Speaking specifically to the concept of increased taxation on beverage alcohol as a social policy to deter alcohol abuse and alcoholism, we again face the absence of valid research to support the position. While proponents of increased taxation argue that alcohol consumption will be reduced, they cannot identify a pricing level that statistically proves reduction. For example, the notion of matching the taxation increase to the Consumer Price Index on a year-to-year basis does not account for the increasing proportion of total income that must be paid in federal, state and local taxes. We would, if we increase taxes on beverage alcohol, be penalizing the overwhelming majority of

-
1. Methodological issues not accurately measured: (1) Changes in drinking patterns, (2) Under and over-reporting in self-reports, (3) Translation of self-reports into statistical reports having serious errors of measurement.

AABEI Alaska Alcohol Beverage Education Institute

page - 4 -

moderate and light drinkers. We would also create a black market environment associated with organized crime and the illicit production of alcoholic beverages. For the hardcore alcoholic, there would be an increase in the use of non-beverage alcohol with all of the health dangers, including death.

There is a second point. It is argued that another reason for increasing the excise tax is to financially support alcoholism programs and other services associated with alcohol abuse problems. Currently, revenues generated from the excise tax on beverage alcohol are placed in the State's General Fund. There are no dedicated funds. When the excise tax rate was first established it was one of the highest rates in the United States. In subsequent years other states have increased their rates to approximate Alaska. The issue, and this is strikingly pointed out in the Legislative Audit Report cited earlier, is cost and programmatic effectiveness and accountability of State-funded alcoholism programs. There should be some return on the investment of tax dollars. Moreover, what is an appropriate level of services and at what rate should alcoholism programs be funded and at what point should there be a return on the investment. There are several issues that the legislature needs to consider:

1. What justification is being used to fund programs? What statistics are being used? What are they based on? Are they adjusted to Alaska? Is there a valid method for demonstrating a reduction in the problem as the direct

AABEI Alaska Alcohol Beverage Education Institute

page - 5 -

result of a program?

The Legislative Audit Report raises these same issues. Before program priorities can be set there needs to be agreement on what the problem is and how one can measure changes. I bring this point up in differentiating between alcohol abuse and alcoholism. Extensive research into the causation of alcohol abuse suggests that at least for some populations, notably rural, ethnic societies, alcohol abuse patterns are associated with such factors as lack of employment, hours of unmanaged time, cultural conflict, a lack of meaningful participation in family, school, and community, a breakdown in spiritual or belief systems. If there is a remedy it lies with the individual attaining a legitimate outlet for higher needs. Alcoholism is not the problem, finding a job is. If we wish to treat alcohol abuse perhaps we should develop a jobs program. The point is that the solution to alcohol abuse problems exist outside traditional prevention and treatment programs.

Before we increase taxation based at least in part on support of alcoholism services, we need, as the Legislative Audit Report recommends, to have fund's priorities established. They need to be specific and measurable.

Alcoholism program funding is established at an artificial level. The current level is directly related to Alaska oil profits and is in no

AABEI Alaska Alcohol Beverage Education Institute

page - 6 -

way related to need. The attempt is being made to justify that inflated level rather than being based on needs assessed prior to oil profit income levels. This artificial level of funding demonstrates labeling theory of deviancy. Society identifies a social problem. Society establishes a bureaucracy to deal with the problem. The primary purpose is then partially set aside and replaced by a need to sustain the bureaucracy. In order to accomplish this goal of survival a representation of the original problem must be manipulated to gain public awareness and support.

In conclusion, there are alcohol abuse and alcoholism problems in Alaska. The assumption that increasing a tax will reduce those problems is not supported scientifically and the by-product may be socially less desirable. The assumption that a tax increase is needed to support alcoholism services is offered at a time when the legislature itself, through its auditing process, raises questions of program accountability and cost effectiveness

Before we pass laws that may have little or no relevance to the problem, I would hope that a careful examination of need, resources and desired outcomes be established. I would hope that this examination would be guided by the established fact that there is no single definition of what alcohol abuse and alcoholism are, their causes or even the best treatment strategies. The control of consumption model is presented as a panacea for reduction of problems lacking scientific validity

AABEI Alaska Alcohol Beverage Education Institute

page -7 -

and has the potential for doing irreparable damage. Our awareness level about alcohol abuse is high and matched by our frustration at finding acceptable solutions. This frustration is costing the tax payer, this year, over fifteen million dollars without any guaranties of success.

AABEI Alaska Alcohol Beverage Education Institute

PRESENTATION

Opposing House Bill 202,
"An Act to increase the Liquor Tax."

Prepared by: Ralph W. Kopansky
representing the Alaska
Alcohol Beverage Education
Institute. Previously,
Consultant to the National
Institute on Alcohol Abuse
and Alcoholism, and former
coordinator of Prevention
and Education and Acting
Clinical Director in
Fairbanks.

Proponent of HB 202
present two arguments
in its support:

1. By increasing the cost of beverage alcohol consumption will decrease and this will reduce alcohol abuse and alcoholism
2. By increasing the cost of beverage alcohol the user will pay for alcoholism services. There is an increased financial need, according to supporters of this bill.

I. SOADA Policy to Reduce the Availability of Alcohol.

1. SOADA has interpreted the State Statute and a 1960 Supreme Court decision, *Boehl vs Sabre Jet Room, Inc.*, as having the authority to promote measures to reduce the availability of alcohol in Alaska. The Boehl decision applied only to the ABC Board and not other agencies of government.

AABEI Alaska Alcohol Beverage Education Institute

page - 2 -

Presentation - Opposing House Bill 202

2. SOADA has adopted the Public Health Epidemiological Model for treating alcohol abuse and alcoholism.
3. One provision of the Public Health Model is to reduce consumption.
 - a. Reducing beverage alcohol consumption will reduce alcohol abuse and alcoholism.
 - b. Proposed Methods of reduction of consumption of beverage alcohol include:
 1. Reducing bar and liquor store hours.
 2. State ownership of package liquor stores.
 3. Raising the drinking age
 4. Increase the tax on beverage alcohol.
4. The Consumption Control Theory is based on statistical models that predict the relationship between consumption levels and health problems, notably cirrhosis of the liver mortality.
 - a. The primary research was completed by S. Lederman in France in the 1950's. This study predicted the relationship of change in alcohol consumption on Homogeneous Populations.

Critics of Lederman's work point out that homogeneous populations (people with same backgrounds) do not exist in complex western societies or societies with mixed ethnic and racial backgrounds.

AABEI Alaska Alcohol Beverage Education Institute

page - 3 -

Presentation - Opposing House Bill 202

- b. Later research, including work in 1978 by Schmidt and Popham, relied on only two factors: (1) apparent beverage alcohol consumption in various societies, and various health problems.
- c. Major scientific criticism of the Control of Consumption Theory:
 - 1. It is not sociological or cultural. No attention is paid to drinking customs, attitudes, norms, and behaviors of various cultural groups or sub-populations by age, sex, race, ethnicity, within a given society.
 - 2. It deals only with an aggregate, Homogeneous population assuming that everybody is the same.
 - 3. The disease concept of alcoholism is never linked to the Control of Consumption Theory, although alcoholism is recognized as a definable clinical disease entity.
 - 4. Clinical experience demonstrates that the alcoholic, with addictive behaviors, will obtain alcohol regardless of method or in spite of controls.
 - 5. Differentiate between Alcoholism, a disease characterized by loss of control of drinking, and alcohol abuse. One does not necessarily relate to the other.
- d. Criticism of Taxation on beverage alcohol as a method of controlling consumption.
 - 1. There is no justification or formula that relates increase of cost to reduction of consumption.

AABEI Alaska Alcohol Beverage Education Institute

page - 4 -

Presentation - Opposing House Bill 202

2. There is no statistical experience that predicts changes in consumer buying practices that could be used to establish a tax or pricing rate at which point consumption would decline.
 3. The notion, suggested by some proponents of taxation that the rate be matched to the Consumer Price Index, is not justified because the CPI does not account for the increasing proportion of total income that must be paid in federal, state and local taxes.
 4. We would, if we increase taxes on beverage alcohol:
 - a. Be penalizing the overwhelming majority of moderate and light drinkers.
 - b. Be creating a potential black market associated with organized crime and illicit production of alcoholic beverages.
 - c. Be observing increase in serious injury and death among the hardcore alcoholic who would turn to other than beverage alcohol
- II. By increasing the tax on beverage alcohol, the user will pay an increasing amount of money to support the cost of services required by increased alcohol abuse.
- i. Criticisms:
 - a. Taxes on beverage alcohol go into the General Fund. There are no dedicated funds.
 - b. The funded level of support for Alcoholism services was based on

AABEI Alaska Alcohol Beverage Education Institute

page - 5 -

Presentation - Opposing House Bill 202

available oil revenues, not need. Statistical needs were made on the basis of funds available.

- c. The Division of Legislative Audit, in its report entitled:

A Special Performance Report on the Department of Health and Social Services State Office of Alcoholism and Drug Abuse, July 1981-December 1982

Makes five recommendations that underscore a need to:

"(1) better document, define, and catalogue information, (2) improve fiscal review over grantees by having more responsibility for directing audit efforts and following up on audit results, (3) closely evaluate administrative costs of proposals from grantees with multiple-funding sources to assure State funds are being used in an efficient, effective and appropriate manner, (4) identify areas where grantees may accomplish tangible needed objectives in a relatively short period of time, (5) consider passage of a resolution to provide SOADA with priorities for grant funding."

2. We recommend that the recommendations be implemented prior to any tax increase. We also recommend that the funding level be based on actual need, direct delivery of services with measurable outcomes.

NOTE REGARDING THE FOLLOWING FRAME(S) ON MICROFILM:
COMPLETE DOCUMENT IS AVAILABLE IN ORIGINAL FILES.
TITLE PAGE ONLY HAS BEEN FILMED.

A SPECIAL PERFORMANCE REPORT
ON THE DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES
STATE OFFICE OF ALCOHOLISM AND DRUG ABUSE

July 1981 - December 1982

Audit Control Number

06-4143-83-S

Commissioner, Department of
Health and Social Services

Dr. Robert L. Smith, Ph.D.

Deputy Commissioners, Department
of Health and Social Services:

Social Services
Health Services

John Pugh, (Acting)
Philip Hardie, MD.

H B

205

STATE OF ALASKA
FISCAL NOTE

Revision Date _____, 1983

I. REQUEST

Bill/Resolution No.: HB205/210
 Title: Relating to Payment of Interest
 Sponsor: Duncan/Shultz by State
 Requestor: House State Affairs

II. FISCAL DETAIL

Agency Affected: All
 Program Category Affected: All
 BRU, Program of Subprogram(s) Affected: _____

EXPENDITURES/REVENUES: (Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 83	FY 84	FY 85	FY 86	FY 87	FY 88
OPERATING						
100 PERSONAL SERVICES						
200 TRAVEL						
300 CONTRACTUAL						
400 COMMODITIES						
500 EQUIPMENT						
600 LAND & STRUCTURES						
700 GRANTS, CLAIMS, ETC	0	1,125.0	1,125.0	1,125.0	1,125.0	1,125.0
TOTAL OPERATING	0	1,125.0	1,125.0	1,125.0	1,125.0	1,125.0
CAPITAL						
REVENUE						

FUNDING: (Thousands of Dollars)

GENERAL FUND	0	1,125.0	1,125.0	1,125.0	1,125.0	1,125.0
FEDERAL FUNDS						
OTHER (Specify Source)						

POSITIONS:

FULL-TIME						
PART-TIME						
TEMPORARY						

III. SOURCE OF FUNDS TO OFFSET FISCAL IMPACT OF BILL:

No source identified by the Legislature.

IV. ANALYSIS: Attach a separate page for any Analysis

Prepared By: Tom Haas
 Division: Finance

Phone: 465-2240
 Date: 3/17/83

Approved by Commissioner: Lisa Rudd
 Department: Administration

Date: 3/17/83

Distribution:

Original to Legislative Finance
 Copy to Office of Management and Budget (for Legislature introduced bills)
 Copy to Department (for Governor introduced bills)
 Copy to Sponsor

IV. ANALYSIS

The Department of Administration is opposed to this Legislation, not because we disagree with the idea of the State paying its bill in a timely manner, but because we feel there are better ways to address this problem. In determining the fiscal impact on mandatory payment of interest, it is impossible to place a definite dollar amount for the cost. Many items must be taken into consideration.

First, in order to calculate what the interest cost would be, a detailed analysis would be necessary to determine what the dollar amount of bills paid in excess of 30 days might be. Readily available information does not exist. However, to show what the potential impact might be, we offer this example, making a number of assumptions.

On the assumption that the State annual budget is \$3.0 billion and that 50% of that budget represents vendor payments effected by this legislation. Further we assume that 5% of the vendor payments might be subject to penalty as defined in the Legislation. Based on these assumptions, the interest penalty could be as high as \$1,125,000.00.

Calculated as follows:

\$3,000,000,000.00	Annual Budget
X 50%	
<hr/>	
\$1,500,000,000.00	Potential Vendor Payments
X 5%	
<hr/>	
\$ 75,000,000.00	5% Subject to Penalty
X 0.15%	
<hr/>	
<u>\$ 1,125,000.00</u>	Interest Penalty for Bills Paid in Excess of 30 Days.

The preferable way to avoid penalty payments is to pay vendors within the 30 day period. This is and always has been the goal of the Department of Administration. The only effective way of doing this is either to divert current staff of the various State agencies to the effort of paying bills timely or to develop the agencies internal procedures and the Department of Administration's automated systems in order to address the payment problem. The cost to the State in providing additional staff or a bill paying effort that would pay all bills within 30 days using the current system has not be determined. The Department of Administration is currently in the process of

redesigning the statewide accounting system which will include features that will improve the bill paying and tracking capabilities of the State.

While we recognize the problem of paying vendors in a timely manner is a serious matter, we should point out that for the most part, vendors are paid timely. For a 12 month period, the State paid on the average of 70,200 invoices a month. During that time, the average payment time was 29 days. The high monthly average was 33 days while the low monthly average was 24 days. During this period, only two months exceeded 30 days payment time.

In addition to the costs of attempting to improve the payment time and the potential interest penalties, we should also consider the cost of increased bureaucracy that would be involved in determining what payments would be subject to penalty, what period of time would be covered, as well as the logistics of making the interest payments, all of these would be costs to the State in time and effort.

Lastly, it should be noted that the funding of the interest payments would need to be 100% State funds. We have been advised by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget that the Prompt Payment Act (P.L. 970177) prohibits the use of Federal grant funds for the agencies that are primarily federally funded. (Copy of OMB letter attached)

Again, we are not opposed to timely payment of vendor bills but are concerned with the method of achieving that goal.



EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

December 14, 1982

MEMORANDUM

SUBJECT: Payment Practices

It has come to our attention that several States have laws, or are considering legislation, that requires the payment of interest penalties to contractors when bills are paid late.

This is to alert you to the fact that the Prompt Payment Act (P.L. 97-177) prohibits the use of Federal grant funds for the payment of such interest penalties. The act says

"(A) in no case shall an obligation to pay such interest penalties be construed to be an obligation of the United States, and

"(B) any payment of such interest penalties shall not be made from funds provided to the grant recipient by a Federal agency, nor shall any non-Federal funds expended for such interest penalties be counted toward any matching requirement applicable to that grant."

We would appreciate your alerting your staff to this prohibition to assure that the Federal Government is not charged improperly for interest penalty costs.

John J. Jordan
Deputy Associate Director
for Financial Management

NOV 18 1982

ADMINISTRATIVE

STATE OF ALASKA
PRELIMINARY STATEMENT OF FISCAL IMPACT

Bill No: HB 205 Date on Bill: 2/16/83
 Title: "An Act providing for payment of interest by state agencies..."
 Sponsor: Duncan
 Requestor: _____

1. Estimated fiscal impacts on:

a. Expenditures:

(Thousands of Dollars)

			FY 83	FY 84	FY 85	FY 86		
Capital								
Operating								
Total				-0-	-0-	-0-		

b. Revenues:

Revenue								
---------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

2. Source of funds to offset fiscal impact of bill:

No fiscal impact is anticipated.

3. Assumptions:

That administrative staffing will remain adequate to avoid delays in bill payment processing such that no interest expenses are incurred.

4. Disclaimer:

This statement has not been reviewed by the OMB in the Office of the Governor. It therefore does not represent the final estimate of fiscal impact.

Prepared By: Marcia Lynn McKenzie Phone: 465-4349
 Division: Administrative Services Date: _____
 Approved by Commissioner: [Signature] Date: 3/8/83
 Department: Public Safety

5. Distribution:

- Original to Legislative Finance
- Copy to OMB
- Copy to Sponsor
- Copy to Requestor

2/15/83

File
MAR 09 1983
HB 205

STATE OF ALASKA
PRELIMINARY STATEMENT OF FISCAL IMPACT

Bill No: HB 205 Date on Bill: 2-16-83
 Title: "Act providing for payment of interest by state agencies on obligations..."
 Sponsor: Duncan
 Requestor: _____

1. Estimated fiscal impacts on:

a. Expenditures:

(Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 83	FY 84	FY 85	FY 86
Capital				
Operating		99.2	104.2	109.4
Total		99.2	104.2	109.4

b. Revenues:

Revenue				

2. Source of funds to offset fiscal impact of bill:

Not specified by sponsor.

3. Assumptions:

Currently there is no method within the system to identify invoices that have not been paid within 30 days from receipt. The department average payment time from the date of invoice to date of payment is less than 30 days. However, we can assume there are invoices that are not processed within 30 days of receipt. The interest payments that may be required should be nominal. Additional staff would be required to investigate each inquiry, make a determination as to whether interest is due, calculate the interest due and process the payment. The designated employee in each region should be at the Accounting Technician I or higher level of responsibility.

4. Disclaimer:

This statement has not been reviewed by the OMB in the Office of the Governor. It therefore does not represent the final estimate of fiscal impact.

Prepared By: Jim Slocum Phone: 465-3911
 Division: Financial Management Date: 3/4/83

Approved by Commissioner: Donna Page for Ron B. Paul Date: 3-7-83
 Department: Transportation & Public Facilities

5. Distribution:

- Original to Legislative Finance
- Copy to OMB
- Copy to Sponsor
- Copy to Requestor

2/15/83

File
HB
205

STATE OF ALASKA
PRELIMINARY STATEMENT OF FISCAL IMPACT

Bill No: HB 205 Date on Bill: 2/16/83
 Title: "An Act providing for payment of interest by state agencies..."
 Sponsor: Duncan
 Requestor: _____

1. Estimated fiscal impacts on:

a. Expenditures:

(Thousands of Dollars)

			FY 83	FY 84	FY 85	FY 86	
Capital							
Operating							
Total				-0-	-0-	-0-	

b. Revenues:

Revenue							
---------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

2. Source of funds to offset fiscal impact of bill:

No fiscal impact is anticipated.

MAR 09 1983

3. Assumptions:

That administrative staffing will remain adequate to avoid delays in bill payment processing such that no interest expenses are incurred.

4. Disclaimer:

This statement has not been reviewed by the OMB in the Office of the Governor. It therefore does not represent the final estimate of fiscal impact.

Prepared By: Marcia Lynn Mckenzie Phone: 465-4349
 Division: Administrative Services Date: _____

Approved by Commissioner: [Signature] Date: 3/8/83
 Department: Public Safety

5. Distribution:

- Original to Legislative Finance
- Copy to OMB
- Copy to Sponsor
- Copy to Requestor

2/15/83

Chart of States with Prompt Payment Statutes or Regulations

STATE	STATUTE/ REGULATION	YEAR ENACTED	CONTRACTS COVERED	STANDARD OF PAYMENT	INTEREST	APPLICATION OF STATUTE/REGULATION
ALASKA	STATUTE	1982	construction	30-day	10.5% annually	Any state or political subdivision of the state
ARIZONA	STATUTE	1982	ALL	30-day	10.0% annually	Any state agency, school district, or office or agency established by a county
CALIFORNIA	STATUTE	1982	ALL	30-day	.25% per day	All state agencies
FLORIDA	STATUTE	1974	ALL	45-day	1% per month	All state agencies
HAWAII	STATUTE	1977	ALL	60-day	1% per month	Any agency of the state or any county
ILLINOIS	STATUTE	1975	ALL	60-day	1% per month	Any state official or agency authorized to provide payment from state funds
INDIANA	STATUTE	1933	highway	180-day	1% per month	State Highway Department
MARYLAND	REGULATION		ALL	35-day construction 45-day non-construction	NONE	All state agencies
MASSACHUSETTS	STATUTE	1977 1961	utility construction	55-day 65-day	NONE **	State, city, town or political subdivision
NEBRASKA*	STATUTE	1975	ALL	30-day	NONE	All state agencies
NORTH CAROLINA	STATUTE	1951	ALL	30-day	NONE	All state agencies
OREGON	STATUTE	1979	ALL	45-day	.67% per month	All state agencies
SOUTH CAROLINA	STATUTE	1981	ALL	30 day	15.0% annually	All agencies and institutions of the state
VIRGINIA	REGULATION	1979	ALL	60-day	1% per month	All state agencies
WASHINGTON	STATUTE	1981	ALL	30-day	1% per month	Every state agency and unit of local government
WEST VIRGINIA	REGULATION		ALL	90-day	6.0% annually	All state agencies
LOUISIANA	STATUTE	1982	ALL	30-day***	.5% per day	All state agencies

* Later found to be unconstitutional.

** Construction statute provides for payment of interest penalties on late payments at a daily rate of three percentage points above the rediscount rate then charged by the Federal Bank of Boston.

*** Except, a 45-day standard of payment for Entitlement Programs

Prepared and distributed by the National Audio Visual Association, 3150 Spring St., Fairfax, Virginia 22031; 703-273-7200.

MEMORANDUM

State of Alaska

TO: Administrative Officers
All Agencies

DATE: December 10, 1982

FILE NO:

TELEPHONE NO: 465-2260

MSA
FROM: Sue Alexander
Pre-Audit Supervisor
Division of Finance
Department of Administration

SUBJECT: Payment Time

After reviewing the Vendor Analysis for the month of November, it has been determined that it took the State an average of 25 days to pay its bills during this month. This is the same number of days as November of last year. The schedule below shows the payment time for each agency.

<u>Agency:</u>	<u>Payment Days</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Payment Days</u>
Office of the Governor		Commerce and Economic Development	
Fiscal - Juneau	20	Fiscal	17
Fiscal - Anchorage	33	Small Business Loans	14
Administration		Energy & Power	29
Fiscal - Juneau	31	AK Power Authority	17
Fiscal - Anchorage	10	Military Affairs	39
Employee Housing	34	Natural Resources	37
Public Defender	19	Fish and Game	65
Leasing & Facilities	16	Public Safety	15
Telecom Systems - Anch.	26	Environmental Conservation	16
Alaska Broadcasting Comm.	13	Community & Regional Affairs	
Older Alaskan Comm.	13	Fiscal	11
Law	23	CETA Division	12
Revenue		Municipal Grants	18
Fiscal	13	Transportation and Public Facilities	
Garnishments	5	Fiscal	37
Education		Anchorage	22
Fiscal	25	Fairbanks	24
Vocational Rehabilitation	42	Anchorage Airport	16
Council of the Arts	21	Southeast	25
Health & Social Services		Ombudsman	4
Fiscal	26	Legislative Affairs	36
Public Assistance	2	Legislative Finance	5
Social Services	14	Legislative Audit	5
Handicapped Child Prog.	44	Alaska Court System	31
Labor			
Fiscal	25		

MSA/gyr
14D1/1209-1/F26

* From date of Invoice to date of Payment.

MEMORANDUM


State of Alaska

TO: Administrative Officers
All Agencies

DATE: November 10, 1982

FILE NO:

TELEPHONE NO: 465-2260

FROM:  H. Sue Alexander
Pre-Audit Supervisor
Division of Finance
Department of Administration

SUBJECT: Payment Time

After reviewing the Vendor Analysis for the month of October, it has been determined that it took the State an average of 25 days to pay its bills during this month. This is a three day increase over October of last year. The schedule below shows the payment time for each agency.

<u>Agency:</u>	<u>Payment Days</u>	<u>Agency:</u>	<u>Payment Days</u>
Office of the Governor		Commerce and Economic	
Fiscal - Juneau	20	Development	
Fiscal - Anchorage	32	Fiscal	17
Administration		Small Business Loans	13
Fiscal - Juneau	26	Energy & Power	22
Fiscal - Anchorage	15	AK Power Authority	13
Employee Housing	25	Military Affairs	35
Public Defender	19	Natural Resources	34
Leasing & Facilities	8	Fish and Game	63
Telecom Systems - Anch.	24	Public Safety	18
Alaska Broadcasting Comm.	6	Environmental Conservation	21
Older Alaskan Comm.	14	Community & Regional Affairs	
Law	23	Fiscal	14
Revenue		CETA Division	13
Fiscal	11	Municipal Grants	19
Garnishments	5	Transportation and Public	
Education		Facilities	
Fiscal	17	Fiscal	31
Vocational Rehabilitation	40	Anchorage	22
		Fairbanks	26
Council of the Arts	27	Anchorage Airport	20
Health & Social Services		Southeast	28
Fiscal	28	Ombudsman	9
Public Assistance	8	Legislative Affairs	42
Social Services	15	Legislative Finance	1
Handicapped Child Prog.	50	Legislative Audit	7
		Alaska Court System	30
Labor			
Fiscal			

HSA/cjk
44F1/0614-1

~~46~~
27
mzj

MEMORANDUM

State of Alaska

TO: Administrative Officers
All Agencies

DATE: October 4, 1982

FILE NO:

TELEPHONE NO: 465-2260

SUBJECT: Payment Time

FROM: M. Sue Alexander
Pre-Audit Supervisor
Division of Finance
Department of Administration

After reviewing the Vendor Analysis for the month of September, it has been determined that it took the State an average of 33 days to pay its bills during this month. This is a five day increase over September of last year. The schedule below shows the payment time for each agency.

<u>Agency:</u>	<u>Payment Days</u>	<u>Agency:</u>	<u>Payment Days</u>
Office of the Governor		Commerce and Economic Development	
Fiscal - Juneau	36	Fiscal	31
Fiscal - Anchorage	37	Small Business Loans	9
Administration		Energy & Power	44
Fiscal - Juneau	37	AK Power Authority	0
Fiscal - Anchorage	15	Military Affairs	31
Employee Housing	20	Natural Resources	30
Public Defender	25	Fish and Game	57
Leasing & Facilities	12	Public Safety	28
Telecom Systems - Anch.	49	Environmental Conservation	45
Alaska Broadcasting Comm.	25	Community & Regional Affairs	
Older Alaskan Comm.	4	Fiscal	22
Law	25	CETA Division	14
Revenue		Municipal Grants	22
Fiscal	22	Transportation and Public Facilities	
Garnishments	5	Fiscal	53
Education		Anchorage	26
Fiscal	34	Fairbanks	32
Vocational Rehabilitation	38	Anchorage Airport	26
Council of the Arts	19	Southeast	33
Health & Social Services		Ombudsman	5
Fiscal	33	Legislative Affairs	38
Public Assistance	7	Legislative Finance	7
Social Services	21	Legislative Audit	9
Handicapped Child Prog.	58	Alaska Court System	35
Labor			
Fiscal	44		

MISA/cjk
44F1/0614-1

MEMORANDUM

State of Alaska

TO: Administrative Officers
All Agencies

DATE: September 13, 1982

FILE NO:

TELEPHONE NO: 465-2260

SUBJECT: Payment Time

MSA
FROM: M. Sue Alexander
Pre-Audit Supervisor
Division of Finance
Department of Administration

After reviewing the Vendor Analysis for the month of August, it has been determined that it took the State an average of 28 days to pay its bills during this month. This is a seven day decrease over August of last year. The schedule below shows the payment time for each agency.

<u>Agency:</u>	<u>Payment Days</u>	<u>Agency:</u>	<u>Payment Days</u>
Office of the Governor		Commerce and Economic	
Fiscal - Juneau	24	Development	
Fiscal - Anchorage	26	Fiscal	50 20
Administration		Small Business Loans	13
Fiscal - Juneau	48	AK Power Authority	15 → 50
Fiscal - Anchorage	35		
Employee Housing	36	Military Affairs	38
Public Defender	28	Natural Resources	38
Leasing & Facilities	9	Fish and Game	72
Telecom Systems - Anch.	27	Public Safety	23
Alaska Broadcasting Comm.		Environmental Conservation	27
Older Alaskan Comm.	14	Community & Regional Affairs	
Law	29	Fiscal	20
Revenue		CETA Division	21
Fiscal	20	Municipal Grants	15
Garnishments	5	Transportation and Public	
Education		Facilities	
Fiscal	26	Fiscal	32
Vocational Rehabilitation	41	Anchorage	26
District School Support		Fairbanks	27
Council of the Arts	34	Anchorage Airport	19
Health & Social Services		Southeast	32
Fiscal	34	Ombudsman	15
Public Assistance	6	Legislative Affairs	37
Social Services	19	Legislative Finance	9
Handicapped Child Prog.	39	Legislative Audit	7
Labor		Alaska Court System	40
Fiscal	22		

MSA/cjk
44F1/0614-1

MEMORANDUM

State of Alaska

TO: Administrative Officers
All Agencies

DATE: August 11, 1982

FILE NO:

TELEPHONE NO: 465-2260

SUBJECT: Payment Time

WSA
 FROM: Sue Alexander
 Pre-Audit Supervisor
 Division of Finance
 Department of Administration

After reviewing the Vendor Analysis for the month of July, it has been determined that it took the State an average of 29 days to pay its bills during this month. This is a one day increase over July of last year. The schedule below shows the payment time for each agency.

<u>Agency:</u>	<u>Days</u>	<u>Agency:</u>	<u>Days</u>
Office of the Governor		Commerce and Economic	
Fiscal - Juneau	33	Development	
Fiscal - Anchorage	30	Fiscal	23
Administration		Small Business Loans	15
Fiscal - Juneau	27	Energy & Power	
Fiscal - Anchorage	19	AK Power Authority	48
Employee Housing	34	Military Affairs	32
Public Defender	20	Natural Resources	29
Leasing & Facilities	14	Fish and Game	66
Telecom Systems - Anch.	28	Public Safety	18
Alaska Broadcasting Comm.	58	Environmental Conservation	32
Older Alaskan Comm.		Community & Regional Affairs	
Law	27	Fiscal	22
Revenue		CETA Division	34
Fiscal	18	Municipal Grants	23
Garnishments	4	Transportation and Public	
Education		Facilities	
Fiscal	36	Fiscal	32
Vocational Rehabilitation	37	Anchorage	23
Council of the Arts	32	Fairbanks	29
Health & Social Services		Anchorage Airport	18
Fiscal	28	Southeast	26
Public Assistance		Ombudsman	9
Social Services	19	Legislative Affairs	25
Handicapped Child Prog.	65	Legislative Finance	9
Labor		Legislative Audit	9
Fiscal	24	Alaska Court System	19

MSA/cjk
 44F1/0014-1-2

MEMORANDUM

State of Alaska

TO: Administrative Officers
All Agencies

DATE: June 14, 1982

FILE NO:

TELEPHONE NO: 465-2260

SUBJECT: Payment Time



Sue Alexander
Pre-Audit Supervisor
Division of Finance
Department of Administration

After reviewing the Vendor Analysis for the month of May, it has been determined that it took the State an average of 24 days to pay its bills during this month. This is a two day decrease over May of last year. The schedule below shows the payment time for each agency.

<u>Agency:</u>	<u>Payment Days</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Payment Days</u>
Office of the Governor		Commerce and Economic Development	
Fiscal - Juneau	30	Fiscal	24
Fiscal - Anchorage	26	Small Business Loans	23
Administration		Energy & Power	21
Fiscal - Juneau	24	AK Power Authority	27
Fiscal - Anchorage	37	Military Affairs	34
Employee Housing	32	Natural Resources	31
Public Defender	19	Fish and Game	66
Leasing & Facilities	11	Public Safety	9
Telecom Systems - Anch.	26	Environmental Conservation	31
Alaska Broadcasting Comm.	16	Community & Regional Affairs	
Older Alaskan Comm.	17	Fiscal	19
Law	25	CETA Division	18
Revenue		Municipal Grants	17
Fiscal	11	Transportation and Public Facilities	
Garnishments	5	Fiscal	36
Education		Anchorage	22
Fiscal	23	Fairbanks	21
Vocational Rehabilitation	38	Anchorage Airport	18
District School Support	18	Southeast	21
Council of the Arts	31	Ombudsman	7
Health & Social Services		Legislative Affairs	13
Fiscal	24	Legislative Finance	4
Public Assistance	65	Legislative Audit	10
Social Services	16	Alaska Court System	27
Handicapped Child Prog.	43		
Labor			
Fiscal	24		

MSA/cjk
44F1/0614-1


TO: Administrative Officers
All Agencies

DATE: May 14, 1982

FILE NO.

TELEPHONE NO: 465-2260

SUBJECT: Payment Time

FROM:  M. Sue Alexander
Pre-Audit Supervisor
Division of Finance
Department of Administration

After reviewing the Vendor Analysis for the month of April, it has been determined that it took the State an average of 25 days to pay its bills during this month. This is the same number of days as April of last year. The schedule below shows the payment time for each agency.

<u>Agency:</u>	<u>Payment Days</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Payment Days</u>
Office of the Governor		Commerce and Economic	22
Fiscal - Juneau	29	Development	
Fiscal - Anchorage	27	Military Affairs	32
Administration		Natural Resources	37
Fiscal - Juneau	27	Fish and Game	60
Fiscal - Anchorage	18	Public Safety	12
Employee Housing	42	Environmental Conservation	25
Public Defender	20	Community & Regional Affairs	
Public Broadcasting		Fiscal	16
Law	25	CETA Division	23
Revenue		Municipal Grants	18
Fiscal	15	Transportation and Public	
Garnishments	6	Facilities	
Education		Fiscal	39
Fiscal	25	Anchorage	13
Vocational Rehabilitation	37	Fairbanks	23
District School Support	17	Anchorage Airport	17
Health & Social Services		Southeast	25
Fiscal	22	Ombudsman	7
Public Assistance	78	Legislative Affairs	1
Social Services	19	Legislative Finance	7
Labor		Legislative Audit	8
Fiscal	20	Alaska Court System	24

lisa/kw
4F1/0514-3/26

MEMORANDUM

State of Alaska

TO: Administrative Officers
All Agencies

DATE: April 2, 1982

FILE NO:

TELEPHONE NO: 465-2260

FROM: H. Sue Alexander
Pre-Audit Supervisor
Division of Finance
Department of Administration

SUBJECT: Payment Time

Just file
Do Not Distribute

After reviewing the Vendor Analysis for the month of March, it has been determined that it took the State an average of 27 days to pay its bills during this month. This is the same number of days as March of last year. The schedule below shows the payment time for each agency.

<u>Agency:</u>	<u>Payment Days</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Payment Days</u>
Office of the Governor		Commerce and Economic Development	23
Fiscal - Juneau	35	Military Affairs	23
Fiscal - Anchorage	41	Natural Resources	30
Administration		Fish and Game	60
Fiscal - Juneau	30	Public Safety	12
Fiscal - Anchorage	22	Environmental Conservation	27
Employee Housing	49	Community & Regional Affairs	
Public Defender	25	Fiscal	15
Public Broadcasting	24	CETA Division	21
Law	22	Municipal Grants	23
Revenue	12	Transportation and Public Facilities	
Fiscal	12	Fiscal	26
Garnishments		Anchorage	32
Education		Fairbanks	32
Fiscal	42	Anchorage Airport	19
Vocational Rehabilitation	37	Southeast	30
District School Support	21	Ombudsman	3
Health & Social Services		Legislative Affairs	8
Fiscal	26	Legislative Finance	2
Public Assistance	1	Legislative Audit	11
Social Services	17	Alaska Court System	25
Labor			
Fiscal	22		
Anchorage Support Service	1		

HSA/lw
4F1/0408-20/26

MEMORANDUM

State of Alaska

Administrative Officers
to All Agencies

March 9, 1982

DATE:

FILE NO: 465-2260

TELEPHONE NO: Payment Time

SUBJECT:

FROM: *M. Sue Alexander*
M. Sue Alexander
Pre-Audit Supervisor
Division of Finance
Department of Administration

After reviewing the Vendor Analysis for the month of February, it has been determined that it took the State an average of 30 days to pay its bills during this month. This is a 2 day decrease over February of last year. The schedule below shows the payment time for each agency.

<u>Agency:</u>	<u>Payment Days</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Payment Days</u>
Office of the Governor		Commerce and Economic	
Fiscal - Juneau	29	Development	26
Fiscal - Anchorage	35	Military Affairs	36
Administration		Natural Resources	41
Fiscal - Juneau	40	Fish and Game	78
Fiscal - Anchorage	34	Public Safety	27
Employee Housing	37	Environmental Conservation	28
Public Defender	26	Community & Regional Affairs	
Public Broadcasting	7	Fiscal	20
Law	25	CETA Division	31
Revenue		Municipal Grants	26
Fiscal	15	Transportation and Public	
Garnishments	8	Facilities	
Education		Fiscal	27
Fiscal	36	Anchorage	33
Vocational Rehabilitation	41	Fairbanks	39
District School Support	33	Anchorage Airport	30
Health & Social Services		Southeast	41
Fiscal	36	Ombudsman	7
Public Assistance	53	Legislative Affairs	12
Social Services	2	Legislative Finance	3
Labor		Legislative Audit	7
Fiscal	31	Alaska Court System	25
Anchorage Support Service	15		

MSA/kw
4F1/0308-4-1/26

MEMORANDUM

State of Alaska

TO: Administrative Officers
All Agencies

DATE: February 8, 1982

FILE NO:

TELEPHONE NO: 465-2260

FROM: *MSB* Sue Alexander
Pre-Audit Supervisor
Division of Finance
Department of Administration

SUBJECT: Payment Time

After reviewing the Vendor Analysis for the month of January, it has been determined that it took the State an average of 31 days to pay its bills during this month. The schedule below shows the payment time for each agency.

<u>Agency</u>	<u>Payment Days</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Payment Days</u>
Office of the Governor		Commerce and Economic	
Fiscal - Juneau	36	Development	23
Fiscal - Anchorage	80	Military Affairs	40
Administration		Natural Resources	34
Fiscal - Juneau	34	Fish and Game	62
Fiscal - Anchorage	47	Public Safety	17
Employee Housing	49	Environmental Conservation	30
Public Defender	33	Community & Regional Affairs	
Public Broadcasting	6	Fiscal	16
Law	29	CETA Division	24
Revenue		Municipal Grants	17
Fiscal	17	Transportation and Public	
Garnishments	8	Facilities	26
Education		Fiscal	37
Fiscal	37	Anchorage	44
Vocational Rehabilitation	39	Fairbanks	27
District School Support	36	Anchorage Airport	42
Health & Social Services		Southeast	25
Fiscal	36	Ombudsman	25
Public Assistance	10	Legislative Affairs	7
Social Services	8	Legislative Finance	10
Labor		Legislative Audit	7
Fiscal	26	Alaska Court System	40
Anchorage Support Service	15		

FJH/FM/020882-5/32

MEMORANDUM

State of Alaska

TO: Administrative Officers
All Agencies

DATE: December 2, 1981


FILE NO:

TELEPHONE NO:

465-2260

SUBJECT:

Payment Time

FROM:  Sue Alexander
Pre-Audit Supervisor
Division of Finance
Department of Administration

After reviewing the Vendor Analysis for the month of November, it has been determined that it took the State an average of 26 days to pay its bills during this month. This is a four day decrease over November of last year. The schedule below shows the payment time for each agency.

<u>Agency</u>	<u>Payment Days</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Payment Days</u>
Office of the Governor		Commerce and Economic	
Fiscal - Juneau	26	Development	29
Administration		Military Affairs	40
Fiscal - Juneau	26	Natural Resources	33
Fiscal - Anchorage	34	Fish and Game	55
Employee Housing	29	Public Safety	21
Public Defender	35	Environmental Conservation	29
Public Broadcasting	79	Community & Regional Affairs	
Law	26	Fiscal	21
Revenue		CETA Division	25
Fiscal	27	Municipal Grants	4
Garnishments	7	Transportation and Public	
Education		Facilities	34
Fiscal	28	Fiscal	36
Vocational Rehabilitation	38	Anchorage	38
District School Support	17	Fairbanks	29
Health & Social Services		Anchorage Airport	47
Fiscal	30	Southeast	
Public Assistance	7	Ombudsman	8
Social Services	7	Legislative Affairs	6
Labor		Legislative Finance	2
Fiscal	20	Legislative Audit	7
Anchorage Support Service	25	Alaska Court System	21

FIMFRI/120781-5/32