

ALASKA LEGISLATURE COMMITTEE FILES, 2003-2004 8672

11066 HOUSE STATE AFFAIRS

HJR

14

REPRESENTATIVE ERIC CROFT

National Veterans Wheelchair Games Contact List

Joseph L. Fox Sr.(800) 424-8200
National President Paralyzed Veterans of America

Anthony J. Pricipi.....(202) 273-7236
United States Secretary of Veterans Affairs

Barbara J. Hopkins.....(907) 243-7903
President, Alaska Disabled Veteran Sports Program, Inc.

Alex Spector.....(907) 257-5460
Director, Alaska VA Healthcare System and Regional Office





REPRESENTATIVE ERIC CROFT

Memorandum

TO: Representative Bruce Weyhrauch
Chair House State Affairs Committee

FROM: Representative Eric Croft

DATE: May 5, 2003

RE: House Joint Resolution 14

I respectfully request that House Joint Resolution 14 be scheduled for a hearing in the House State Affairs Committee at your earliest possible convenience. I have attached a sponsor statement and background information on this resolution. Thank you.

FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA
2003 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Fiscal Note Number: _____
 Bill Version: HJR NO. 14
 () Publish Date: _____

Revision Date/Time (Note if correction): _____ Dept. Affected: Military and Veterans Affa
 Title 2006 National Veterans Wheelchair G BRU _____
 Sponsor Croft Component _____
 Requester _____ Component No. _____

Expenditures/Revenues (Thousands of Dollars)

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

OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009
Personal Services			0.0			
Travel			0.0			
Contractual			0.0			
Supplies			0.0			
Equipment			0.0			
Land & Structures			0.0			
Grants & Claims			0.0			
Miscellaneous			0.0			
TOTAL OPERATING	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

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

CHANGE IN REVENUES ()						
-------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

FUND SOURCE (Thousands of Dollars)

1002 Federal Receipts						
1003 GF Match						
1004 GF						
1005 GF/Program Receipts						
1037 GF/Mental Health						
Other (Specify Type--Do not abbreviate)						
TOTAL	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Estimate of any current year (FY2003) cost: 0.0

Mark this box (X) if funding for this bill is included in the Governor's FY 2004 budget proposal:

POSITIONS

Full-time						
Part-time						
Temporary						

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary)

HJR NO.14 resolves that the Alaska State Legislature urges Anthony J. Principi, Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and Joseph L. Fox, Sr., President, Paralyzed Veterans of America to hold the 2006 National Veterans Wheelchair Games in Anchorage, Alaska. No fiscal impact anticipated.

Prepared by: John W. Cramer
 Division: Administrative Services
 Approved by: _____
 Agency: _____

Phone 465-4602
 Date/Time 5/2/03 1:57 PM
 Date 5/2/2003

NUMBER OF PAGES = 11



DATE: April 23, 2003
 TO: Mark Gnadt/Representative Eric Croft
 FROM: Julie Dodds/Anchorage convention & Visitors Bureau
 RE: National Veteran Wheelchair Games

Mark:

Here is some information and some letters of support. I hope it is enough information. If you need additional information or have any questions please call me at 907 257-2327.

I am mailing you a couple of videos. If you would please send them back to me when you are through, or if you do need to keep them, just let me know so I can get replacements.

Please call me when you receive this and let me know if this is what you were looking for.

Thank you for your support.

Take care.

Julie Dodds
 National Sales Manager
 Anchorage Convention & Visitors Bureau
 524 West Fourth Avenue
 Anchorage AK 99501-2212
 Toll Free: 888-257-2381 ext 327
 Local: (907) 257-2327
 Fax: (907) 278-5559

Email: jdodds@anchorage.net

Wild About Anchorage!
 Anchorage: 2002 All-America City

www.anchorage.net

524 W. Fourth Avenue
 Anchorage, Alaska
 99501-2212

907-276-418
 Fax 907-278-5559

www.anchorage.net
 Email: info@anchorage.net

NATIONAL VETERANS WHEELCHAIR GAMES JULY 2006

Representatives from the VA and Paralyzed Veterans of America (PVA) have completed an initial site inspection in Anchorage last Fall, September 2002. They toured the local facilities and met with the hoteliers, Egan Convention Center, Sullivan Arena, Anchorage School District and Airport Representatives, along with the Department of Veterans Affairs Alaska Healthcare System and Regional Office to discuss the feasibility of Anchorage hosting these Games. Their findings were that Anchorage does have the facilities to host these Games. They are going to do a final site inspection this summer, July 2003, following the Wheelchair Games in Long Beach, California.

Dates-

Currently looking at July 2-7, 2006.

Hotels-

"Hotel Facilities to include at least 600 rooms that can reasonably be made accessible for wheelchairs. Accessibility refers to entrance into the hotel, number of elevators, door widths, size of lobby/registration area and width of hallways. In addition, 250 rooms are needed for sponsors, officials, and VIP's."

The hotels in Anchorage have tentatively committed 900 rooms. This includes the five largest downtown properties and does not include the many other hotels in and around the downtown Anchorage area.

Transportation-

Currently working with the Anchorage School District and First Student.

THE
FOLLOWING
DOCUMENT(S)
ARE
POOR
ORIGINAL
COPIES

**NATIONAL VETERANS WHEELCHAIR GAMES
JULY 2006**

EVENT	VENUE(S)	ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
Track:	Sullivan Arena/Mulcahy Stadium/Kosinski Fields	8 lane certified track
	East High School	8 lane certified track
Swimming:	Bartlett High School Pool	Olympic size 50 meter
Baske*ball, Quad Rugby:	Sullivan Arena/Mulcahy Stadium/Kosinski Fields	3 Courts
	University of Alaska Anchorage	1 Court
Bowling:	AMF East 40 Lanes	40 lanes
	Polar Bowl	40 lanes
	Park Lanes	34 lanes
	Center Bowl	30 lanes
	Jewel Lake Bowling Center	26 lanes
Field Events:	Sullivan Arena/Mulcahy Stadium/Kosinski Fields	
Slalom, Table Tennis, Weightlifting,	Egan Center/Sullivan Arena	
Opening/Closing Ceremonies	Egan Center/Sullivan Arena	
Exposition and Registration:	Egan Center	
Archery:	Sullivan Arena/Mulcahy Stadium/Kosinski Fields	
Nine Ball:	Hawallan Brian's	20 tables
	Anchorage Billiard Palace	16 tables
	Minnesota Billiards	15 tables
	Runarack Billiards	14 tables
Banquet facilities:	Egan Center/Sullivan Arena	



DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS
Alaska Healthcare System and Regional Office
2925 DeBarr Road
Anchorage AK 99508-2989

• December 16, 2002

In Reply Refer To: 463/135

Chair, Bid and Site Selection Committee (11K)
Attention: Mr. Tom Brown
Department of Veterans Affairs
South Texas Veterans Healthcare System
7400 Merton Minter Blvd.
San Antonio, TX 78229

Dear Mr. Brown:

It is my pleasure to fully support the Alaska VA Healthcare System and Regional Office (AVASHRO) as the host site for the 2006 National Veterans Wheelchair Games.

We look forward to working with your office and the Paralyzed Veterans of America in making 2006 the best in the history of the games.

The AVASHRO appreciates this opportunity and hopes you will select our facility and region for the 2006 National Veterans Wheelchair Games. Please find enclosed our bid package for this event.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Alex Spector".

Alex Spector
Director

Enclosure



Municipality of Anchorage

Office of the Mayor

George P. Wuerch, Mayor

Anchorage



2002

December 9, 2002

Ms. Julie Dodds
National Sales Manager
Anchorage Convention & Visitors Bureau
524 W. 4th Avenue
Anchorage, AK 99501-2212

Dear Ms. Dodds,


On behalf of the Municipality of Anchorage, I am pleased to support the Anchorage Convention & Visitors Bureau's bid to host the National Veterans Wheelchair Games in July 2006.

From numerous experiences, be assured that the community is very capable of hosting such an event, and doing so in a way that makes it a most memorable for participants and visitors.

We understand the commitment required to host a major event such as this. Capable organizers and countless volunteers have proven time and again that they are up to the challenge, and hopefully we will get the chance to do so again.

Good luck with your bid to host a successful National Veterans Wheelchair Games in Anchorage.

Sincerely,


George Wuerch
Mayor



December 6, 2002

Anchorage School District

1600 DeBarr Road
P. O. Box 196614
Anchorage, Alaska 99519-6614
(907) 742-4000

SCHOOL BOARD

Jake Metcalfe
President

Tim Steele
Vice President

Mary Marks
Clerk

Harold A. Drummond
Treasurer

Rita Holthouse

Debbie Ossinger

John Stinger

SUPERINTENDENT

Carol Comeau

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

I have been asked to write a letter of support for the Anchorage Convention & Visitors Bureau to host the National Veterans Wheelchair Games to be held in July 2006. The idea of the games coming to Anchorage is very exciting, and I certainly support the Convention & Visitors Bureau in their endeavor to bid for this event.

When individuals from the Veterans Administration (VA) and the Paralyzed Veterans of America (PVA) were in Anchorage to do a site inspection to see if Anchorage had the facilities to host this event, they were able to meet with District representatives to discuss transportation, facilities, and rentals issues. Steve Kalmes, Director of ASD Transportation, and Sharon Schoonmaker, Rentals Manger, were very supportive and agreed to further discussions once Anchorage is awarded the bid.

Anchorage recently hosted the 2001 Winter Special Olympic World Games, which many of our students participated in and supported. It was a great benefit to them and we see this event as another inspirational and educational opportunity for our 50,000 students.

I encourage you to consider Anchorage as the site of the National Veterans Wheelchair Games in July 2006.

Sincerely,

Carol Comeau
Superintendent

December 3, 2002

Mr. Tom Brown
 Director
 National Wheelchair Games
 South Texas Veterans Health Care System
 7400 Merton Minter Blvd.
 San Antonio TX 78284



ANCHORAGE
 Convention &
 Visitors Bureau

Dear Mr. Brown:

The Anchorage Convention & Visitors Bureau is extending a warm invitation to you and the participants of the National Veterans Wheelchair Games to come to Anchorage in July of 2006.

We are excited about the possibility of hosting your distinguished group. Anchorage is a fabulous destination that offers not only first-class accommodations and meeting facilities, but also excellent airline service from the "Lower 48."

The possibilities to experience, in conjunction with a conference, some of Alaska's famous attractions and activities are endless: glaciers, mountains, wildlife, Native art, day cruises, fishing and flightseeing options are waiting for you.

When the participants of the National Veterans Wheelchair Games come to Anchorage, they will experience the warm hospitality that Alaskans offer their visitors. For many delegates, attending a meeting in our city is an once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to visit America's Last Frontier, a dream for many in the nation!

I offer you the full assistance of the ACVB and its staff to making your convention a most memorable and successful event.

We look forward to greeting you in Anchorage for one of your most enjoyable conferences!

Sincerely,

Bruce Bustamante
 President & CEO

524 W. Fourth Avenue
 Anchorage, Alaska
 907-276-4188

907-276-4188
 Fax 907-276-4359

www.anchorage.net
 E-mail: info@anchorage.net

December 12, 2002

Mr. Tom Brown
Director
National Wheelchair Games
South Texas Veterans Health Care System
7400 Merton Minter Blvd.
San Antonio, TX 78284



Dear Tom:

I am most delighted to hear of your positive interest in Anchorage as a site for the 2006 National Wheelchair Games. It was a pleasure to have met you when you were up last. Being the Chief Operating Officer of the Special Olympics World Winter Games, (held in Anchorage in March of 2001), talking with you brought back many exciting and fond memories. The thought of Anchorage being given *another* opportunity to host a world-class sporting event, such as this, is unbelievable.

As you might remember from our conversation, the World Games hosted over 6000 people from nearly 80 nations. Typical to Alaskan's frontier spirit, we had over 6000 volunteers with 2000 on the waiting list. Those 2000 excess volunteers initiated a new "Spectator Team" program that I could easily see taking off at the National Wheelchair Games. Adopting a country or team approach became the task for these spectator teams leaving everyone involved with "home town" cheering squads. You would not believe the roar of the crowds as you entered each of the sporting venues around the city.


As one person, so profoundly wrote after the Games, "Take time to contact a friend or colleague who might have been in Anchorage during the Games. You will hear about the 'sense of place' projected by this city and felt by participants. You will hear about the winter beauty of the surrounding mountains and sea. You will hear descriptions of Alaska and Alaskans which convey 21st Century diversity with 19th Century friendliness, openness, and happiness - and about a city which is large enough to throw a world class party, yet small enough to still get excited about having out of town guests."

Anchorage's huge success with the World Games should make it clear of our cities capacity and readiness to host another world-class event - the National Wheelchair Games.

Sign me up! Sign up nearly 6000 other volunteers. There is no doubt that you will be warmed by the Alaskan Spirit and amazed by the time and energy Alaskan's will give the National Wheelchair Games.


Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions regarding the World Games and any of the programs that were initiated (such as the Spectator Teams or the Educational programs) because of the Games. I could talk about them for hours.

Sincerely,



Melissa J. Anderson
2001 Special Olympics World Winter Games
Executive Director and Chief Operating Officer
melissa@alaskadestinations.com
907-244-0504

December 10, 2002


George M. Sullivan Sports Arena

Julie Dodds
National Sales Manager
Anchorage Convention & Visitors Bureau
524 W. Fourth Avenue
Anchorage, AK 99501-2212

Dear Ms. Dodds,

Sullivan Arena and Ben Boeke Ice Arena are excited about the possibility for Anchorage to host the National Veterans Wheelchair Games in July 2006!


As official venues of the Opening and Closing Ceremonies of the 2001 Special Olympic World Winter Games, Sullivan Arena and Ben Boeke Ice Arena have proven to be ideal facilities for events of substantial size and importance.

SMG of Alaska, Inc. Sullivan Arena, and Ben Boeke Ice Arena embrace this opportunity, and welcomes the Wheelchair Games to our great city.

Please let me know if we can assist you with your bidding process.

Thank you.

Regards,



Tanya Hoak
Director of Sales and Marketing
SMG of Alaska, Inc.



Private Management for Public Facilities

SMG of Alaska Inc.

William A. Egan Civic and Convention Center

November 26, 2002

Mr. Tom Brown
Director
National Wheelchair Games
South Texas Veterans Health Care System
7400 Merton Minter Blvd.
San Antonio, TX 78284

Dear Mr. Brown:

Thank you for your interest in the Egan Center! We are pleased to be considered as the location for the 2006 National Wheelchair Games tentatively scheduled for July 2-7, 2005. Alternate date of July 9-15, 2006.

The William A. Egan Civic and Convention Center is very versatile in configuration and our staff takes the extra effort to ensure your event is a success. Our facility is fully A.D.A. compliant; with power assist doors to lobby and elevator access to all floors. Our Executive Chef Richard Hubbard is one of only six Certified Executive Chefs in Alaska. In all departments our friendly, professional staff strive to surpass the expectations of our guests.

We are centrally located near all the major downtown hotels, shopping and restaurants. There are three parking garages combined with on street parking providing 3000 spaces within a three-block radius and parking can be arranged for your attendees. The cost to your participants is \$2.50 for all day parking when arranged in advance. Our meeting rooms are spacious making your attendees very comfortable and we have a large pre-function space available for your use for exhibits, coat check or registration.

If I can be of any assistance or if you have any questions please call, my direct line is 907-263-2848 and my email address is phyllis@egancenter.com. Our website is www.egancenter.com.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Phyllis Rice".

Phyllis Rice
Event Coordinator

cc: Julie Dodds, ACVB

HJR

24

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 24
IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA
TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE - FIRST SESSION

BY REPRESENTATIVES GRUENBERG, Dahlstrom

Introduced: 4/14/03
Referred: State Affairs

OS STA
HJR 24

A RESOLUTION

1 Relating to the Alaska-Yukon Intergovernmental Relations Accord, to annual legislative
2 exchanges, and to continuing intergovernmental work on matters of joint concern and
3 mutual interest.

4 BE IT RESOLVED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:

5 WHEREAS the citizens of Yukon Territory, Canada, and the citizens of Alaska share
6 many interests and connections, and have long enjoyed an extensive and open common
7 border; and

8 WHEREAS the Yukon Legislative Assembly and the Alaska State legislature have a
9 longstanding tradition of annual legislative exchanges since 1980; and

10 WHEREAS Pat Duncan, the former Premier of the Yukon, and Tony Knowles, the
11 former Governor of Alaska, signed the Alaska-Yukon Intergovernmental Relations Accord on
12 September 8, 2000, for Alaska and the Yukon Territory to work together on matters of joint
13 concern and enter into specific cooperative arrangements; and

Amendment #1

14 WHEREAS the Alaska-Yukon Intergovernmental Relations Accord will expire on
15 September 8, 2003;

1 **BE IT RESOLVED** that the Alaska State Legislature supports the extension of the
2 Alaska-Yukon Intergovernmental Relations Accord; and be it

3 **FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Alaska State Legislature offers to continue to
4 engage in annual legislative exchanges with the Yukon Legislative Assembly and to continue
5 to work with the Yukon Legislative Assembly on matters of joint concern and mutual interest.

6 **COPIES** of this resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Dennis Fentie, Premier of
7 Yukon Territory; and to the Honorable Frank Murkowski, Governor of Alaska.

Alaska State Legislature

House of Representatives

Judiciary Committee
State Affairs Committee
Military & Veterans' Affairs Committee

Finance Subcommittees:
Courts
Department of Law
Department of Military & Veterans' Affairs



Session:
Alaska State Capitol
Juneau, AK 99801-1182
Phone: (907) 465-4940
Fax: (907) 465-3766
toll free: (866) 465-4940

Interim:
716 W. 4th Avenue
Anchorage, AK 99501-2133
Phone: (907) 269-0123
Fax: (907) 269-0124

Representative Max Gruenberg

Sponsor Statement for HJR 24

Alaska and the Yukon Territory have many common issues and interests. In recognition of this reality, former Governor Tony Knowles and former Premier Pat Duncan of the Government of Yukon signed an intergovernmental relations accord on Sep. 8, 2000, to work together on matters of joint concern and enter into specific cooperative arrangements. The agreement is set to expire on September 8, 2003. This resolution will urge Governor Frank Murkowski and Dennis Fentie, Premier of Yukon, to extend the accord. It will also state the desire of the Alaska State Legislature to continue the tradition of annual legislative exchanges with the Yukon Legislative Assembly.



**ALASKA-YUKON INTERGOVERNMENTAL
RELATIONS ACCORD**

BETWEEN

**THE GOVERNMENT OF YUKON
AS REPRESENTED BY
THE PREMIER**

AND

**THE STATE OF ALASKA
AS REPRESENTED BY
THE GOVERNOR**

WHEREAS, the citizens of the Yukon and Alaska share many ties including an extensive common border and aboriginal kinship ties; and,

WHEREAS, the citizens of the Yukon and Alaska have a long-standing relationship of friendship and trust; and,

WHEREAS, the citizens of the Yukon and Alaska have mutual concerns and interests about issues around the environment, economic development, and human development; and,

WHEREAS, the Yukon Government and the State of Alaska have existing valuable cooperative agreements in the areas of tourism, transportation, and resource management; and,

WHEREAS, the Yukon Legislative Assembly and the Alaska State Legislature have a tradition of annual legislative exchanges under the auspices of another branch of government; and,

WHEREAS, the North American Free Trade Agreement provides for enhanced trade relations between Canada and the United States; and,

WHEREAS, there are opportunities to be explored to enhance the relationship between the two governments, to resolve issues, and to develop opportunities for their respective regions.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, the Governments of the Yukon and Alaska pledge to continue to work together on matters of joint concern and mutual interest, to share information, promote understanding, and identify additional areas in which there can be joint formal and informal cooperation;


The Premier and the Governor agree to meet as necessary to review issues of mutual interest, foster joint economic opportunities, and monitor progress towards enhanced joint cooperative efforts;

The Premier and the Governor will continue to appoint officials to serve as principal points of liaison for policy purposes and the expeditious sharing of information about mutual interests and will encourage the two governments to work together on matters of joint concern;


The Premier and the Governor, or their designees will when appropriate enter into specific cooperative arrangements on particular matters of common interest, including, but not limited to, tourism, energy, trade, transportation, and fish and wildlife management. Such agreements will be incorporated as appendices to this Intergovernmental Relations Accord.

This Accord shall be in effect from its date of signature through September 8, 2003, and may be reviewed and amended by the consent of both governments.

Dated at Juneau, Alaska, this 8th day of September, 2000.



The Honourable Pat Duncan
Premier
Government of Yukon



The Honorable Tony Knowles
Governor
State of Alaska

MEMORANDUM

March 27, 2003

To: Legislators going to Whitehorse

From: Senator Fred Dyson

RE: Mission in Whitehorse

This memo is to inform you about our upcoming trip to Whitehorse, Yukon Territory

HISTORY- Alaska and the Yukon Territory have been having and hosting legislative exchanges for about a decade. Former Senator Randy Phillips took the lead in this. The two jurisdictions alternate hosting this event. The issues vary and the players have changed, but this effort has always been profitable.

DIFFERENCES IN GOVERNMENTS –Yukon has a parliamentary form of government. This combines what we would call the executive and legislative branches. Some members of the Legislative Assembly also have a specific “portfolio” which means they are also the “commissioner” of a specific department of the territorial government. The parliamentary system allows the minority “loyal opposition” no power to propose legislation or amend bills. The Minority exerts most of its power by questioning the “Government” majority, and trying to embarrass them. This mostly happens at the conclusion of each days legislative session.

The parliamentary system generally does not allow for cross party coalitions or caucuses for a specific purpose such as our “bush” caucus, fish caucus etc. The last few years a bit of that may be happening in Northern B.C.

The parliamentary system also does not generally have committees. In the last few years, Yukon Territory has started having some committees and they actually may have been encouraged in that direction by working with us.

NATIVE ISSUES- The Canadians and especially the people in Yukon Territory are deeply involved in native land claims issues. They call their aboriginal population “First Nations” and refer to “Bands” instead of tribes or villages or native corporations. A decade ago they, evolved a brilliant system and process for resolving the issues of land, hunting rights, subsistence, mineral rights etc. My understanding is that there are still many unresolved issues and that the Bands are being aggressive about holding up some economic development projects until they are sure that their Bands needs and wants are met. Some efforts by NW Territory may be in that category. I understand that most of Yukon's First Nations People are related to our Athabaskan People. I believe there are First Nations People on Yukon's North Coast that are related to Alaska's Inupiat people.

CANADIAN CULTURE AND CUSTOMS- In general, Canadians feel that most Americans are negligently ignorant of their neighbors to the north and that Canadians are taken for granted and/or ignored. Many Canadians feel defensive about being over-whelmed by the dominating culture and economic power of their American neighbors. Canadians watch American TV programs, buy American products read American books and magazines but they have three or four very popular Prime Time TV shows that do nothing but ridicule how ignorant and

insensitive Americans are. Hockey is the national pastime and the movement of Canadian teams and players to the US is troubling.

Canadians and Americans have fought side-by-side in all major wars and police actions for 90 years. The Canadians responded heroically after 9/11. Canadians are fighting with our troops in Afghanistan and Iraq. Canadian warships are on duty off Iraq. The Canadians are major partners in the defense of North America. We share the longest open border in the world, and are each other's greatest trading partners.

Most Western Canadians feel slighted and frustrated by the actions and attitudes of their Federal Government in Ottawa, not unlike how we feel about our Federal Government. Most Canadians in Northern British Columbia and Yukon feel they have more in common with us than they do with their Southern and Eastern countrymen.

HEALTH INSURANCE AND FIREARMS- A huge difference in attitudes shows up on these issues. Canada has a very extensive Public Health Program that takes care of everybody. It has problems, but Canadians love it and are not very open to hearing it criticize. The westward expansion and settlement of Canada was different than the US. In Canada, the government and law enforcement in the form of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police went with the first wave of non-native settlers. This reduced the need for individuals to protect themselves. The Canadian Federal Government has gone very far in greatly restricting handgun ownership and registering all firearms. Northern Canadians tend to resent their Federal Governments anti-gun actions, but they tend to think that Americans are gun happy and off base on our passionate defense of our 2nd Amendment.

OUR JOB ON THIS TRIP is to help convince the Yukoners that we are their friends and allies, and we have much in common and our futures are in-separately linked together. We want them to see us as fellow Northerners and partners in a great, mutual future. We **MUST NOT** convey that they are, or will be, ignored. We need these folks as equal partners and they need to know that we will always want their input and full partnership.

MAJOR COMMON PROJECTS include a gas pipeline partnership that will allow the stranded gas from both of our jurisdictions to get to market. The folks in Yukon are also very interested in having a railroad link to the Canadian National railroad at Fork Nelson. The railroad link would open up some major mining areas in Yukon Territory as well as Central Alaska. The Yukon area also shares revenues from tourist that are going to and from Alaska. There is an agreement in place that uses some American funds to maintain and upgrade the Alaska Highway using Canadian equipment and personnel. This seems to work very well.

At least twice the Knowles administration cut off winter/spring road maintenance to a northern cross border road from Alaska to the Klondike. This hurt many Canadians and Governor Murkowski has restored this service I believe. We have some wildlife issues, most prominently the porcupine caribou herd. There are some on going joint projects.

The Yukon Government has not supported opening ANWR because their First Nations oppose it. It is probably no wise to argue this.

31st Legislative Assembly
Seating Plan – Effective April 1, 2003

Speaker – Ted Staffen

Deputy Speaker – Patrick Rouble

Steve Cardiff

Mount Lorne

Lorraine Peter

Vuntut Gwitchin

Gary McRobb

Official Opposition House Leader

Kluane

Todd Hardy

Leader of the Official Opposition

Whitehorse Centre

Eric Fairclough

Mayo-Tatchun

Pat Duncan

Leader of the Third Party

Porter Creek South

Speaker's Chair

Clerk

TABLE

Deputy Clerk

Peter Jenkins

H&SS YWCHSB

Government House Leader

Klondike

Dennis Fentie

Premier

ECO

Finance

Economic Development

Watson Lake

Elaine Taylor

Justice

Tourism & Culture

Whitehorse West

Jim Kenyon

Environment

Porter Creek North

John Edzerza

Education

PSC

McIntyre-Takhini

Ted Staffen

Speaker

Riverdale North

Haakon Arntzen

Copperbelt

Archie Lang

Energy, Mines & Resources

YDC/YEC

Porter Creek Centre

Glenn Hart

Highways & Public Works

Community Services

YLC, YHC

Riverdale South

Patrick Rouble

Deputy Speaker

Southern Lakes

Dean Hassard

Pelly-Nisutlin

Brad Cathers

Lake Laberge

**GUESTS IN THE GALLERY ARE NOT TO PARTICIPATE IN ANY WAY.
 COMMENTS OR APPLAUSE ARE NOT ALLOWED.**

FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA
2003 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Fiscal Note Number: _____
 Bill Version: HJR 24
 () Publish Date: _____

Revision Date/Time (Note if correction): _____ Dept. Affected: _____
 Title Alaska-Yukon Intergovernmental BRU _____
Relations Accord Component _____
 Sponsor Rep. Gruenberg, Rep. Dahlstrom _____
 Requester House State Affairs Component No. _____

Expenditures/Revenues (Thousands of Dollars)

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

OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009
Personal Services						
Travel	7.0					
Contractual	3.0					
Supplies						
Equipment						
Land & Structures						
Grants & Claims						
Miscellaneous						
TOTAL OPERATING	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

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

CHANGE IN REVENUES ()						
-------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

FUND SOURCE (Thousands of Dollars)

1002 Federal Receipts						
1003 GF Match						
1004 GF						
1005 GF/Program Receipts						
1037 GF/Mental Health						
Other (Specify Type--Do not abbreviate)						
TOTAL	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Estimate of any current year (FY2003) cost: 0.0
 Mark this box (X) if funding for this bill is included in the Governor's FY 2004 budget proposal:

POSITIONS

Full-time						
Part-time						
Temporary						

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary)

Prepared by: House State Affairs Committee Phone _____
 Division _____ Date/Time: 5/9/03 1:53 PM
 Approved by: Representative Bruce Weyhrauch, Chair Date: 5/9/2003
 Agency _____

HJR

27

FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA
2003 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Fiscal Note Number: _____
Bill Version: HJR 27
() Publish Date: _____

Revision Date/Time (Note if correction): _____ Dept. Affected: Department of Corrections
Title Support for a federal appropriation for BRU Administration & Operations
expansion of the Anchorage Jail Component _____
Sponsor _____ Component No. _____
Requester _____

Expenditures/Revenues (Thousands of Dollars)

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

OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009
Personal Services	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Travel	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Contractual	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Supplies	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Equipment	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Land & Structures	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Grants & Claims	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Miscellaneous	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL OPERATING	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
-----------------------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------

CHANGE IN REVENUES ()	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
-------------------------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------

FUND SOURCE (Thousands of Dollars)

FUND SOURCE	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009
1002 Federal Receipts	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1003 GF Match	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1004 GF	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1005 GF/Program Receipts	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1037 GF/Mental Health	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other (Specify Type-Do not abbreviate)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Estimate of any current year (FY2003) cost: 0.0

Check this box (X) if funding for this bill is included in the Governor's FY 2004 budget proposal:

POSITIONS

Full-time	0	0	0	0	0	0
Part-time	0	0	0	0	0	0
Temporary	0	0	0	0	0	0

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary)

The passage of this resolution would have no fiscal impact on the Department of Corrections. Should the funding be received for the expansion of the Anchorage Jail, it is expected that both construction and operation of the 200 additional beds will be paid for with federal funds.

Prepared by: Jerry D. Burnett, Director
Division Administrative Services
Approved by: Portia C.K. Parker, Deputy Commissioner
Agency Department of Corrections

Phone 465-3339
Date/Time 5/12/03 2:56 PM
Date 5/12/2003



REPRESENTATIVE KEVIN MEYER

HOUSE DISTRICT 30

Sponsor Statement

House Joint Resolution 27

"Relating to support for a federal appropriation for expansion of the Anchorage Jail"

HCR 27 encourages the United States Congress to appropriate \$30,000,000 for a 200-bed expansion at the Anchorage Jail to house additional federal prisoners.

The United States Marshals Service contracts with the state to provide 50 federal prisoner beds in Alaska's correctional system – over the past few years, this contract has been met or exceeded at all times. Currently, the department has more than 100 federal prisoners incarcerated in state facilities, the overwhelming majority of whom are held in Anchorage. The US Marshals Service has requested an increase in the contract with the Department of Corrections (DOC) to meet the anticipated increased demand for bed space for federal prisoners; however, the DOC does not have the capacity to meet this increased demand without an expansion at the Anchorage Jail.

Recently, the Federal Bureau of Prisons (FBP) conducted a study on the feasibility of building a federal prison in Alaska. The study concluded that there were not enough Alaska prisoners within the FBP system to justify a separate federal correctional facility in Alaska. Therefore, the US Marshals Service requested that the DOC work with them to expand the Anchorage Jail to meet the increasing demand for federal prison beds.

The 200-bed expansion at the Anchorage Jail to house federal prisoners should not impact the state budget; all related construction costs and additional operating costs will be paid for with federal receipts.

It is in the best interest of all parties to expand the available prison bed space in the Anchorage area. This expansion will help reduce overcrowding on the current state system and will lower the cost to the federal government for transports between Seattle and Anchorage.

HJR

30

FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA
2004 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Fiscal Note Number: _____
 Bill Version: HJR 30
 () Publish Date: _____

Revision Date/Time (Note if correction): _____ Dept. Affected: Administration
 Title Repeal of the Government Pension Offset and the Windfall RDU Various
Elimination Provisions from the Social Security Act. Component Various
 Sponsor Rep. Gatto
 Requester State Affairs Component No. 64

Expenditures/Revenues (Thousands of Dollars)

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

OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010
Personal Services						
Travel						
Contractual						
Supplies						
Equipment						
Land & Structures						
Grants & Claims						
Miscellaneous						
TOTAL OPERATING	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

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

CHANGE IN REVENUES ()						
-------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

FUND SOURCE (Thousands of Dollars)

1002 Federal Receipts						
1003 GF Match						
1004 GF						
1005 GF/Program Receipts						
1037 GF/Mental Health						
Other (Specify Type--Do not abbreviate)						
TOTAL	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Estimate of any current year (FY2004) cost: 0.0
 Mark this box (X) if funding for this bill is included in the Governor's FY 2005 budget proposal:

POSITIONS

Full-time	0	0	0	0	0	0
Part-time	0	0	0	0	0	0
Temporary	0	0	0	0	0	0

ANALYSIS: *(Attach a separate page if necessary)*
 This resolution would have no affect on benefits computed by the Public Employees' or Teachers' Retirement Systems. Repeal of the Government Pension Offset and the Windfall Elimination Provision would affect the calculation of Social Security benefits.

Prepared by: Melanie Millhorn Phone 465-4408
 Division Retirement and Benefits Date/Time 1/20/03 1:06 P.M.
 Approved by: Milre Miller, Commissioner Date _____
 Agency Administration

Alaska State Legislature

SESSION ADDRESS:
Alaska State Capitol
Juneau, Alaska 99801
Phone: (907) 465-3743
1-800-565-3743
Fax: (907) 465-2381



INTERIM ADDRESS:
600 E Railroad Avenue
Wasilla, AK 99654
Phone : 907-376-3725
Fax: (907) 376-4768

Representative Carl Gatto

HJR 30

Relating to supporting the repeal of the Government Pension Offset and the Windfall Elimination Provisions from the Social Security Act.

Sponsor Statement

There are those Alaskans who, whether retired or nearing retirement, are examining the issues on income in retirement and measuring it against expenses. Generally retirees consider two major sources of retirement income, pensions and social security. Added together retirement becomes a better alternative to continuing on the job, especially when the job was a long career in public service. There are a pair of flies in the ointment, and very large ones at that. The flies in the ointment are two federal social security requirements that effectively say that if you receive a pension, the social security you have come to believe you deserve is reduced or eliminated. The effect is that spouses or surviving members are being unreasonably penalized because they earned a pension to help them in retirement.

The Government Pension Offset reduces public employees' Social Security spousal or survivor benefits by two-thirds of their public pension. The Windfall Elimination Provision reduces the earned Social Security benefits of an individual who also receives a public pension from a job not covered by Social Security. To many of these retired individuals whose spouses had chosen careers as teachers, policemen, firemen and other public service positions find that at the age of retirement that they are unfairly being penalized by an offset that takes away their Social Security benefits. For many retired and widowed members this reduction in spousal or survivor benefits can mean the difference between retirement that allows you to be at a level of self-sufficiency or at a level of poverty. This offset has the harshest effect on those who can least afford it: widowed lower-income women.

Estimates indicate that 9 out of 10 public employees affected by the Government Pension Offset lose their entire spousal benefit, even though their deceased spouses paid Social Security taxes for the required number of years. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the Government Pension Offset reduces benefits for some 300,000 individuals by more than \$3,600.00 a year. The impact of this offset in benefits is felt primarily in states which public employees like educators are not covered by Social Security, this includes 15 other states widespread from Alaska to Maine. This impact affects at least one-third of America's education workforce.

At a time when we are faced with a national teacher shortage the Government Pension Offset and Windfall Elimination Provision directly impacts not only the efforts for recruitment of quality teachers but also discourages qualified professional people from changing career paths to enter into the teaching profession. A critical effort to reduce class sizes, and meet the requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act necessitates the need for additional teachers. Estimates for the number of new teachers needed nationally range from 2.2 to 2.7 million by the year 2009.

We ask for your support for House Joint Resolution 30 so that our Congressional Delegation can take swift action to repeal the Government Pension Offset and Windfall Elimination Provision. We ask this on behalf of the many retired and respected public service members of our community, our firemen, police officers, educators and other public employees that should not be penalized for their years of dedication and public service.

The Government Pension Offset and Windfall Elimination Provision

What are the Government Pension Offset and Windfall Elimination Provision?

The Government Pension Offset (GPO) reduces public employees' Social Security spousal or survivor benefits by two-thirds of their public pension.

The Windfall Elimination Provision (WEP) reduces the earned Social Security benefits of an individual who also receives a public pension from a job not covered by Social Security.

Who do the GPO and WEP Affect?

The GPO affects people who work as federal, state, or local government employees, including educators, police officers, and firefighters, if the job is not covered by Social Security.

The WEP affects people who worked in jobs not covered by Social Security and in jobs in which they earned Social Security benefits – such as educators who do not earn Social Security in the public schools, but who work part-time or during the summer in jobs covered by Social Security. The WEP also affects people who move from a job in which they earn Social Security to a job, such as teaching, in which they do not.

The impact of the GPO and WEP is primarily felt in those states in which public employees like educators are not covered by Social Security (Alaska, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Georgia, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Missouri, Nevada, Ohio, Rhode Island, and Texas). However, because people move from state to state, there are affected individuals everywhere.

How do the GPO and WEP work?

The GPO reduces Social Security spousal or survivor benefits by two-thirds of the individual's public pension.

The WEP reduces the factor by which average earnings are multiplied to determine Social Security benefits. The amount of reduction depends on when the person retires and how many years of earnings he or she has accumulated.

What is the Impact of the GPO and WEP?

Estimates indicate that 9 out of 10 public employees affected by the GPO lose their entire spousal benefit, even though their deceased spouse paid Social Security taxes for many years. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the GPO reduces benefits for some 300,000 individuals by more than \$3,600 a year. The GPO has the harshest impact on those who can least afford the loss: lower-income women.

The WEP causes low-paid public employees outside the Social Security system, like educators, to lose up to sixty percent of their Social Security benefits. The WEP also impacts the teaching profession, as people are less likely to leave other careers, in which they earn Social Security benefits, to become educators.

What Can be Done to Address the GPO and WEP?

Congress can pass legislation to repeal the GPO and WEP. Representatives McKeon (R-CA) and Berman (D-CA) and Senators Feinstein (D-CA) have introduced bills (H.R. ~~2838/G-4523~~ to repeal the GPO and WEP. *and Susan Collins (R-ME)*

HR 5941 S 349

Social Security



The Windfall Elimination Provision How It Affects Your Social Security Retirement Or Disability Benefits

If you work for an employer who doesn't withhold Social Security taxes, such as a government agency or an employer in another country, the pension you get based on that work may reduce your Social Security benefits.

Your benefit can be reduced in one of two ways. One is the "government pension offset" and applies only if you receive a government pension and are eligible for Social Security benefits as a spouse or widow(er). For more information on the offset, ask Social Security for the factsheet, *Government Pension Offset* (Publication No. 05-10007).

The other way—the "windfall elimination provision"—affects how your retirement or disability benefits are figured if you receive a pension from work not covered by Social Security. The formula used to figure your benefit amount is modified, giving you a lower Social Security benefit. This factsheet explains the formula.

Who Is Affected?

The windfall elimination provision primarily affects people who earned a pension from working for a government agency and also worked at other jobs where they paid Social Security taxes long enough to qualify for retirement or disability benefits. It also may affect you if you earned a pension in any job where you didn't pay Social Security taxes, such as in a foreign country.

The modified formula applies to you if you reach 62 or become disabled after 1985 and first become eligible after 1985 for a monthly pension based in whole or in part on work, where you did not pay Social Security taxes. You're considered eligible for a pension if you meet the pension requirements, even if you continue to work.

An important point: The windfall elimination provision affects Social Security benefits when any part of a person's federal service after 1956 is covered only under Civil Service Retirement System (CSRS) deductions. However, federal service where Social Security taxes are withheld (Federal Employee Retirement System or CSRS Offset) do not reduce Social Security benefit amounts.

The modified formula is used to figure your Social Security benefit beginning with the first month you get both a Social Security benefit and the other pension.

Why Is A Different Formula Used?

The modified formula prevents a windfall to people who would unfairly benefit from provisions aimed at low-income workers. Social Security benefits replace a percentage of a worker's pre-retirement earnings and the benefit computation formula includes factors that make sure lower-paid workers get a higher return than highly paid workers. For example, lower-paid workers could get a Social Security benefit that equals about 60 percent of their pre-retirement earnings. The average replacement rate for highly paid workers is about 25 percent.

Before 1983, people who worked in jobs not covered by Social Security received benefits that were computed as if they were long-term, low-wage workers. They received the advantage of higher percentage benefits in addition to their other pension. The modified formula eliminates this windfall.

How Does It Work?

Social Security benefits are based on the worker's average monthly earnings adjusted for inflation. We separate your average earnings into three amounts and multiply the amounts using three factors. For example, for a worker who turns 62 in 2001, the first \$561 of average monthly earnings is multiplied by 90 percent; the next \$2,820 by 32 percent; and the remainder by 15 percent.

The 90 percent factor is reduced in the modified formula and phased in for workers who reached age 62 or became disabled between 1986 and 1989. For those who reach 62 or become disabled in 1990 or later, the 90 percent factor is reduced to 40 percent.

There are exceptions to this rule. For example, the 90 percent factor is not reduced if you have 30 or more years of "substantial" earnings in a job where you paid Social Security taxes. See the table on the back that lists the amount of "substantial" earnings for each year.

If you have 21 to 29 years of substantial earnings, the 90 percent factor is reduced to between 45 and 85 percent. The second table shows the percentage used depending on the number of years of "substantial" earnings.

Year	Substantial Earnings
1937-50	\$ 900 ¹
1951-54	900
1955-58	1,050
1959-65	1,200
1966-67	1,650
1968-71	1,950
1972	2,250
1973	2,700
1974	3,300
1975	3,525
1976	3,825
1977	4,125
1978	4,425
1979	4,725
1980	5,100
1981	5,550
1982	6,075
1983	6,675
1984	7,050
1985	7,425
1986	7,875
1987	8,175
1988	8,400
1989	8,925
1990	9,525
1991	9,900
1992	10,350
1993	10,725
1994	11,250
1995	11,325
1996	11,625
1997	12,150
1998	12,675
1999	13,425
2000	14,175
2001	14,925

¹Credited earnings from 1937-50 are divided by \$900 to get the years of coverage (maximum 14 years).

Years of Substantial Earnings	Percentage
30 or more	90 percent
29	85 percent
28	80 percent
27	75 percent
26	70 percent
25	65 percent
24	60 percent
23	55 percent
22	50 percent
21	45 percent
20 or less	40 percent

Some Exceptions

The modified formula does not apply to survivors benefits. It also does not apply to you if:

- you are a federal worker first hired after December 31, 1983;
- you were employed on December 31, 1983 by a nonprofit organization that was exempt from Social Security and it became mandatorily covered under Social Security on that date;
- your only pension is based on railroad employment;
- your only work where you did not pay Social Security taxes was before 1957; or
- you have 30 or more years of substantial earnings under Social Security.

Guarantee

Workers with relatively low pensions are protected because the reduction in the Social Security benefit under the modified formula cannot be more than one-half of that part of the pension attributable to earnings after 1956 not covered by Social Security.

For More Information

Visit www.ssa.gov for more Social Security information. You also can get recorded information 24 hours a day, including weekends and holidays, by calling 1-800-772-1213. You can speak to a service representative between 7 a.m. and 7 p.m. on business days. Our lines are busiest early in the week and early in the month, so, if your business can wait, it's best to call at other times. Whenever you call, have your Social Security number handy.

People who are deaf or hard of hearing may call our toll-free TTY number, 1-800-325-0778, between 7 a.m. and 7 p.m. on business days.

We treat all calls confidentially. We also want to make sure that you receive accurate and courteous service. That's why we have a second Social Security representative monitor some incoming and outgoing telephone calls.

Social Security Administration
SSA Publication No. 05-10045
July 2001 (Recycle prior editions)
ICN 460275
Unit of Issue: HD (one hundred)

THE
FOLLOWING
DOCUMENT(S)
ARE
POOR
ORIGINAL
COPIES



Social Security Administration

SSA Publication No. 05-10007

August 2000

(January 1999 edition may be used)

Government Pension Offset

A Law That Affects Spouse's Or Widow(er)'s Benefits

If you worked for a federal, state or local government where you did not pay Social Security taxes, the pension you receive from that agency may reduce any Social Security benefits for which you are qualified.

There are two laws that may reduce your benefits. One of them affects the way your Social Security retirement or disability benefits are figured. For more information about that provision, contact Social Security for the factsheet, *A Pension From Work Not Covered By Social Security* (Publication No. 05-10045).

The second law affects Social Security benefits you receive as a spouse or widow(er). This factsheet provides answers to questions you may have about this provision.

I Receive A Government Pension. Will I Receive Any Social Security On My Spouse's Record?

Maybe not. Some or all of your Social Security spouse's or widow(er)'s benefit may be offset if you receive a pension from a job where you did not pay Social Security taxes.

How Much Is The Offset?

The offset will reduce the amount of your Social Security spouse's or widow(er)'s benefits by two-thirds of the amount of your government pension. In other words, if you get a monthly civil service pension of \$600, two-thirds of that, or \$400, must be used to offset your Social Security spouse's or widow(er)'s benefits. If you're eligible for a \$500 widow(er)'s benefit, you'll receive \$100 per month from Social Security ($\$500 - \$400 = \$100$).

If you take your annuity in a lump sum, the offset is figured as if you chose to receive regular monthly benefits.

Why Is There An Offset?

Social Security spouse's benefits provide income to wives and husbands who have little or no Social Security benefits of their own. From the beginning of the Social Security program, spouse's benefits were intended for women and men who were financially dependent on their husbands or wives who worked at jobs covered by Social Security.

Before the offset provisions were enacted, many government employees qualified for a pension from their agency and for a spouse's benefit from Social Security, even though they were not dependent on their husbands or wives.

This example helps clarify why there is an offset.

Bill Smith collects a Social Security benefit of \$600 per month. His wife, Mary, is potentially eligible for a wife's benefit of up to 50 percent of Bill's, or \$300. However, Mary also worked and paid into Social Security, qualifying for her own retirement benefit of \$400. By law, Mary can only receive the higher of the two benefits she is eligible for, not both. She will not receive any wife's benefits because her \$400 retirement benefit, in effect, "offsets" her \$300 wife's benefit.

Bill's neighbor, Tom, also gets a Social Security benefit of \$600 per month. But his wife, Nancy, had a job with the federal government, instead of one where she paid Social Security taxes, and earned a civil service pension of \$800 per month. Before the government pension offset provisions were in place, Nancy would have been eligible for both her \$800 civil service pension and a \$300 wife's benefit on Tom's Social Security record. With the offset provision, Nancy does not qualify for a wife's benefit from Social Security and is treated the same as Mary.

Who Is Exempt?

- Any state, local or military service employee whose government pension is based on a job where he or she was paying Social Security taxes on the last day of employment. (Some government entities were not initially covered by Social Security, but chose to participate in Social Security at a later date.)
- Anyone whose government pension is not based on his or her own earnings.
- Anyone who received or who was eligible to receive a government pension before December 1982 and who meets all the requirements for Social Security spouse's benefits in effect in January 1977.
- Anyone who received or was eligible to receive a federal, state or local government pension before July 1, 1983, and was receiving one-half support from her or his spouse.
- Federal employees, including Civil Service Offset employees, who are mandatorily covered under Social Security. (Civil Service Offset employees are federal employees rehired after December 31, 1983, following a break in service of more than 365 days and who had five years of prior Civil Service Retirement System [CSRS] employment.)
- Federal employees who chose to switch from CSRS to the Federal Employees' Retirement System (FERS) on or before December 31, 1987, as well as those employees who were allowed to make a belated switch to FERS through June 30, 1988. Employees who switched outside of these periods, including those who switched during the open season from July 1, 1998 through December 31, 1998, need five years under FERS to be exempt from the government pension offset.

What About Medicare?

Even if you do not receive cash benefits on your spouse's record, you can still get Medicare at age 65.

Can I Still Get Benefits On My Own Record?

The offset applies only to Social Security benefits as a spouse or widow(er). However, your own benefits may be reduced due to another provision of the law. Contact Social Security for the factsheet, *A Pension From Work Not Covered By Social Security* (Publication No. 05-10045).

March 2003

Dear Friend,

We, of NEA-Alaska/Retired, are asking for your help to pass two bills in Congress which will affect your retirement income. The bills, HR594 and SB349, will repeal two provisions which determine the amount you will receive from Social Security. These two provisions, the Government Pension Offset (Spousal or widow's offset) and the Windfall Elimination Provision, may reduce your Social Security Benefit by as much as two-thirds of the amount you expect to receive. ***IT IS IMPORTANT THAT YOU CONTACT EACH MEMBER OF OUR DELEGATION, MURKOWSKI, STEVENS AND YOUNG, AND ASK THEM TO SIGN ON TO THIS LEGISLATION AND TO VOTE FOR ITS PASSAGE.***


Many of you have earned government pensions in Alaska, a non-Social Security state, many of you have worked extra jobs in the summer or after work to get Social Security credits - ***YOU WILL BE AFFECTED.*** Some of you retired from other states where you contributed to Social Security and you moved to Alaska to teach or work in the school system to get additional retirement - ***YOU WILL BE AFFECTED.*** I applied for Social Security at age 62 and 65 and was denied the spousal benefit both times because I chose to teach. My mother who is 94 and never worked has drawn a spousal benefit for almost 30 years. It is not fair that we are not only denied because we chose a specific profession but must also send a check for \$171 every three months to pay for Medicare Part B. Please help us eliminate these unfair provisions.


You can get all the information you need on this bill, including definitions, from www.nea.org and then, click on government. You can write your message and email, fax or mail it right from that web site. ***Please help by doing it NOW.*** You can keep track of current federal legislation by calling NEA's Legislative Hotline at 1-800-833-4000.

If you have the time and if Murkowski, Stevens and Young have offices in your city, please visit the offices personally, get to know the aides and deliver your message or letter in person. Let them know you want our delegation to sign on to this legislation and to work for its passage. Tell your personal story of how the two unfair provisions affect or will affect you.

The Legislation Information Office is also a good source of information and help. Call them and they will help you get your message to DC.

PLEASE ACT NOW. We need to let the delegation know the issues and concerns - we need to tell our stories. Please help and pass the word to others. Thank you in advance for taking time out of your busy schedules - ***IT WILL MAKE A DIFFERENCE TO YOU AND YOUR FUTURE EARNINGS.***


Gayle Harbo, Vice President of NEA-Alaska/Retired



The Government Pension Offset and Windfall Elimination Provision

Talking Points

The Government Pension Offset (GPO) and Windfall Elimination Provision (WEP) penalize people who have dedicated their lives to public service by taking away benefits they have EARNED.

- Nine out of ten public employees affected by the GPO lose their entire spousal benefit, even though their spouse paid Social Security taxes for many years.
- The WEP causes hard-working people to lose up to sixty percent of the benefits they earned themselves.
- Many workers rely on misleading Social Security Administration statements that fail to take into account the GPO and WEP when projecting benefits.

This is a national problem – there are affected people in all states.

- The impact of the GPO and WEP is not just felt in those states in which public employees like educators are not covered by Social Security. Because people move from state to state, there are affected individuals everywhere.
- The number of people impacted across the country is growing every day as more and more people reach retirement age.

The loss of income forces some people into poverty.

- Some 300,000 individuals lose an average of \$3,600 a year due to the GPO – an amount that can make the difference between self-sufficiency and poverty. Impacted people have less money to spend in their local economy and sometimes have to turn to expensive government programs like food stamps to make ends meet.

We have a national teacher shortage, but the GPO and WEP discourage people from entering/ staying in the profession.

- Individuals who worked in other careers are less likely to want to become teachers if doing so will mean a loss of earned Social Security benefits. The GPO and WEP are also causing current educators to leave the profession, and students to choose courses of study other than education.
- Non-Social Security states are going to find it increasingly difficult to attract quality educators as more folks learn about the GPO and WEP.

The GPO and WEP don't only impact educators – other public employees like police officers and firefighters are hurt.

- We should respect, not penalize, public service.

Congress can take immediate action.
Congress should pass legislation that would completely repeal the GPO and WEP.



CORRECTION

THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENT(S)
HAVE BEEN REFILMED TO
ASSURE LEGIBILITY OR PAGINATION



Central Microfilm Services
Department of Education & Early Development
State of Alaska

March 2003

Dear Friend,

We, of NEA-Alaska/Retired, are asking for your help to pass two bills in Congress which will affect your retirement income. The bills, HR594 and SB349, will repeal two provisions which determine the amount you will receive from Social Security. These two provisions, the Government Pension Offset (Spousal or widow's offset) and the Windfall Elimination Provision, may reduce your Social Security Benefit by as much as two-thirds of the amount you expect to receive. ***IT IS IMPORTANT THAT YOU CONTACT EACH MEMBER OF OUR DELEGATION, MURKOWSKI, STEVENS AND YOUNG, AND ASK THEM TO SIGN ON TO THIS LEGISLATION AND TO VOTE FOR ITS PASSAGE.***


Many of you have earned government pensions in Alaska, a non-Social Security state, many of you have worked extra jobs in the summer or after work to get Social Security credits - ***YOU WILL BE AFFECTED.*** Some of you retired from other states where you contributed to Social Security and you moved to Alaska to teach or work in the school system to get additional retirement - ***YOU WILL BE AFFECTED.*** I applied for Social Security at age 62 and 65 and was denied the spousal benefit both times because I chose to teach. My mother who is 94 and never worked has drawn a spousal benefit for almost 30 years. It is not fair that we are not only denied because we chose a specific profession but must also send a check for \$171 every three months to pay for Medicare Part B. Please help us eliminate these unfair provisions.

You can get all the information you need on this bill, including definitions, from www.nea.org and then, click on government. You can write your message and email, fax or mail it right from that web site. ***Please help by doing it NOW.*** You can keep track of current federal legislation by calling NEA's Legislative Hotline at 1-800-833-4000.

If you have the time and if Murkowski, Stevens and Young have offices in your city, please visit the offices personally, get to know the aides and deliver your message or letter in person. Let them know you want our delegation to sign on to this legislation and to work for its passage. Tell your personal story of how the two unfair provisions affect or will affect you.

The Legislation Information Office is also a good source of information and help. Call them and they will help you get your message to DC.

PLEASE ACT NOW. We need to let the delegation know the issues and concerns - we need to tell our stories. Please help and pass the word to others. Thank you in advance for taking time out of your busy schedules - ***IT WILL MAKE A DIFFERENCE TO YOU AND YOUR FUTURE EARNINGS.***



Gayle Harbo, Vice President of NEA-Alaska/Retired

HOW TO SEND MESSAGES OR MAKE CONTACT

Ask our Congressional Delegation to sign on to the bills, SB349 and HR594, which will repeal the unfair Social Security Government Pension Offset and Windfall Elimination Provision.

1. Use NEA's website - www.nea.org/lac/socsec - get information and send your message immediately.
2. Contact the Congressional Delegation at local offices - take your letter in and it will be faxed to the legislator.

Anchorage	Murkowski 510 L St. Suite 550 99501	Stevens 222 West 7th Ave.#2 99513	Young 222 7th Ave.#3 99513
Fairbanks	Federal Bldg 101 W 12th Av. Rm 214 99701	Federal Bldg 101W 12th Av Rm 210 99701	Federal Bldg 101 W12thAv Rm 212 99701
Juneau	PO Box 21647 Room 971 99802	PO Box 20149 Room 971 99802	PO Box 21247 Room 971 99802

The entire Delegation may be contacted at these offices in the following cities:


Kenai Trading Bay Prof. Bldg
 130 Trading Bay Rd. Suite 350
 Kenai Ak 99611

Ketchikan 109 Main St.
 Ketchikan Ak. 99901-6482

Mat-Su 851 Westpoint Dr. Suite 307
 Wasilla Ak 99654

3. To track current federal legislation call NEA's Hotline at 1-800-833-4000

PLEASE ACT NOW - WE NEED YOUR HELP AND YOU NEED TO PROTECT YOUR RETIREMENT INCOME.



The Government Pension Offset and Windfall Elimination Provision

Talking Points

The Government Pension Offset (GPO) and Windfall Elimination Provision (WEP) penalize people who have dedicated their lives to public service by taking away benefits they have EARNED.

- Nine out of ten public employees affected by the GPO lose their entire spousal benefit, even though their spouse paid Social Security taxes for many years.
- The WEP causes hard-working people to lose up to sixty percent of the benefits they earned themselves.
- Many workers rely on misleading Social Security Administration statements that fail to take into account the GPO and WEP when projecting benefits.

This is a national problem – there are affected people in all states.

- The impact of the GPO and WEP is not just felt in those states in which public employees like educators are not covered by Social Security. Because people move from state to state, there are affected individuals everywhere.
- The number of people impacted across the country is growing every day as more and more people reach retirement age.

The loss of income forces some people into poverty.

- Some 300,000 individuals lose an average of \$3,600 a year due to the GPO – an amount that can make the difference between self-sufficiency and poverty. Impacted people have less money to spend in their local economy and sometimes have to turn to expensive government programs like food stamps to make ends meet.

We have a national teacher shortage, but the GPO and WEP discourage people from entering/staying in the profession.

- Individuals who worked in other careers are less likely to want to become teachers if doing so will mean a loss of earned Social Security benefits. The GPO and WEP are also causing current educators to leave the profession, and students to choose courses of study other than education.
- Non-Social Security states are going to find it increasingly difficult to attract quality educators as more folks learn about the GPO and WEP.

The GPO and WEP don't only impact educators – other public employees like police officers and firefighters are hurt.

- We should respect, not penalize, public service.

Congress can take immediate action.
Congress should pass legislation that would completely repeal the GPO and WEP.



Respect Public Service!

Repeal the Government Pension Offset and Windfall Elimination Provision

What are the Government Pension Offset and Windfall Elimination Provision?

The Government Pension Offset (GPO) reduces public employees' Social Security spousal or survivor benefits by two-thirds of their public pension. The Windfall Elimination Provision (WEP) reduces the earned Social Security benefits of an individual who also receives a public pension from a job not covered by Social Security.

The GPO affects people who work as federal, state, or local government employees, including educators, police officers, and firefighters, if the job is not covered by Social Security. The WEP affects people who worked in jobs not covered by Social Security and in jobs in which they earned Social Security benefits - such as educators who do not earn Social Security in the public schools, but who work part-time or during the summer in jobs covered by Social Security. The WEP also affects people who move from a job in which they earn Social Security to a job, such as teaching, in which they do not.

Why Should these Offsets be Repealed?

The offsets penalize people who have dedicated their lives to public service by taking away benefits they have EARNED. Nine out of ten public employees affected by the GPO lose their entire spousal benefit, even though their

spouse paid Social Security taxes for many years. The WEP causes hard-working people to lose up to sixty percent of the benefits they earned themselves.


This is a national problem —there are affected people in all states. The impact of the GPO and WEP is not just felt in those states in which public employees are not covered by Social Security. Because people move from state to state, there are affected individuals everywhere. The number of people impacted across the country is growing every day as more and more people reach retirement age.

The loss of income forces some people into poverty. Some 300,000 individuals lose an average of \$3,600 a year due to the GPO - an amount that can make the difference between self-sufficiency and poverty. Impacted people have less money to spend locally and sometimes have to turn to expensive government programs like food stamps to make ends meet.

We have a national teacher shortage, but the GPO and WEP discourage people from entering/staying in the profession. Individuals who worked in other careers are less likely to want to become teachers if doing so will mean a loss of earned Social Security benefits. The GPO and WEP are also causing current educators to leave the profession, and students to choose courses of study other than education. Non-Social Security states are going to find it increasingly difficult to attract quality educators as more folks learn about the GPO and WEP.

Please support legislation to repeal the GPO and WEP.





The Government Pension Offset and Windfall Elimination Provision Real Stories

A Texas Teacher:

Martha became a teacher in 1978, after working at a job where she paid into Social Security for many years. Based on her earnings under Social Security, she was eligible for a monthly benefit of \$415 a month, in addition to her monthly teaching pension of \$1423. However...

Impact of the WEP:

Martha's earned Social Security benefit — \$415 monthly — is reduced to \$206 a month.

Martha's husband worked under Social Security his whole life. As a widow, Martha should be eligible for a \$970 monthly widow's benefits.

Impact of the GPO:

Her benefit is reduced by two-thirds of her monthly teacher pension. She will receive only a \$21 monthly widow's benefit.

A Colorado teaching assistant:

Stella worked for over 20 years in the Colorado public school system. Her husband worked under Social Security for 50 years. After her husband's death, Stella expected to receive \$520 a month in widow's benefits in addition to her monthly school pension of \$637. However...

Impact of the GPO:

The GPO reduced Stella's survivor benefits by two-thirds of her public pension. Stella only receives \$96 a month in Social Security.

A Georgia school bus driver:

Debbie worked for several years under Social Security before going to work for Georgia public schools. She retired after 14 years as a school bus driver. She expected to receive a monthly Social Security benefit of \$600 based on what she earned under Social Security. However...

Impact of the GPO and WEP:

Debbie's actual Social Security benefit is only \$61 a month because of the GPO and WEP.

An Oklahoma teacher who moved to California:

Bob worked for many years in Oklahoma under Social Security before moving to California and becoming a teacher. Based on his earnings, he should have received approximately \$360 a month in Social Security benefits. However...

Impact of the WEP:

When he retired, Bob discovered his Social Security benefit was reduced to \$172 a month because of the WEP.

A new teacher in Maine:

Paul changed careers when he left the military and is now teaching high school math. However...

Impact of the WEP:

Loss of a good teacher. Because he has learned that the WEP will dramatically reduce the Social Security he earned if he remains a teacher, Paul does not intend to stay in the teaching profession.

nea

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

www.nea.org

Making Public Schools Great for Every Child

NEA Government Relations 202-822-7300

www.nea.org/lac/socsec

January 2003





Examples of Impact

A teacher from Texas:

Martha began working as a teacher in 1978, after working for many years in the private sector. Based on her earnings, she was told she would be eligible for \$415 a month in Social Security in addition to her monthly teaching pension of \$1423. Martha's husband also worked in the private sector and paid into Social Security. Based on his earnings, Martha should have been eligible for \$970 in widow's benefits. However...

Impact of the WEP:

A loss of \$209. Because of the WEP, Martha has been notified that her own earned Social Security benefits will be reduced to \$206, a loss of \$209 each month.

Impact of the GPO:

A loss of over \$900 a month. Martha has also been told that, should she outlive her spouse, her widow's benefits would be reduced by 2/3 of her public pension, or by \$949 a month. ($\$1423 \times 2/3 = \949). Therefore, her \$970 benefit would be reduced to only \$21 a month.

A teaching assistant from Colorado:

Stella worked for over 20 years in the Colorado public school system. She receives a monthly pension of \$637. Her husband worked in the private sector, paying into Social Security for 50 years. After her husband's death, Stella expected to receive \$520 a month in survivor benefits. However...

Impact of the GPO:

A loss of \$424 a month. The GPO reduced Stella's survivor benefits by 2/3 of her public pension. ($\$637 \times 2/3 = \424). As a result, Stella only receives \$96 a month in Social Security. Her total monthly income is \$733, instead of the \$1157 she would have gotten if not for the GPO.

A school bus driver from Georgia:

Debbie worked for several years in the private sector and then for 14 years as a school bus driver. She expected to receive a monthly Social Security benefit of \$600. However...

Impact of the GPO and WEP:

A loss of over \$500 a month. Debbie's actual Social Security benefit is only \$61 a month because of the GPO and WEP.

A teacher who moved from Oklahoma to California:

Bob worked for many years in Oklahoma in jobs covered by Social Security before moving to California and becoming a teacher. He was informed by the Social Security Administration that he would receive approximately \$360 a month based on his earlier earnings in the private sector. However...

Impact of the WEP:

A loss of \$183 a month. When he retired, Bob discovered his Social Security benefit was reduced to \$172 a month because of the WEP. Bob calculates he loses \$2196 a year, and will have lost nearly \$11,000 by October 2002.

A new teacher in Maine:

Paul changed careers when he left the military and is now teaching high school math. However...

Impact of the WEP:

Loss of a good teacher. Because he has learned that the WEP will dramatically reduce the Social Security he earned if he remains a teacher, Paul does not intend to stay in the teaching profession.

nea

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

www.nea.org

Making Public Schools Great for Every Child

NEA Government Relations 202-822-7300,

www.nea.org/lac/socsec

January 2003



The Government Pension Offset and Windfall Elimination Provision

What are the Government Pension Offset and Windfall Elimination Provision?

The Government Pension Offset (GPO) reduces public employees' Social Security spousal or survivor benefits by two-thirds of their public pension.

The Windfall Elimination Provision (WEP) reduces the earned Social Security benefits of an individual who also receives a public pension from a job not covered by Social Security.

Who do the GPO and WEP Affect?

The GPO affects people who work as federal, state, or local government employees, including educators, police officers, and firefighters, if the job is not covered by Social Security.

The WEP affects people who worked in jobs not covered by Social Security and in jobs in which they earned Social Security benefits – such as educators who do not earn Social Security in the public schools, but who work part-time or during the summer in jobs covered by Social Security. The WEP also affects people who move from a job in which they earn Social Security to a job, such as teaching, in which they do not.

The impact of the GPO and WEP is primarily felt in those states in which public employees like educators are not covered by Social Security (Alaska, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Georgia, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Missouri, Nevada, Ohio, Rhode Island, and Texas). However, because people move from state to state, there are affected individuals everywhere.

How do the GPO and WEP work?

The GPO reduces Social Security spousal or survivor benefits by two-thirds of the individual's public pension. (see over for examples)

The WEP reduces the factor by which average earnings are multiplied to determine Social Security benefits. The amount of reduction depends on when the person retires and how many years of earnings he or she has accumulated. (see over for examples)

What is the Impact of the GPO and WEP?

Estimates indicate that 9 out of 10 public employees affected by the GPO lose their entire spousal benefit, even though their deceased spouse paid Social Security taxes for many years. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the GPO reduces benefits for some 300,000 individuals by more than \$3,600 a year. The GPO has the harshest impact on those who can least afford the loss: lower-income women.

The WEP causes low-paid public employees outside the Social Security system, like educators, to lose up to sixty percent of their Social Security benefits. The WEP also impacts the teaching profession, as people are less likely to leave other careers, in which they earn Social Security benefits, to become educators.

What Can be Done to Address the GPO and WEP?

Congress can pass legislation to repeal both the GPO and WEP.

nea

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

www.nea.org

Making Public Schools Great for Every Child

NEA Government Relations 202-822-7300

www.nea.org/lac/socsec

January 2003



Quick Links

[SEND CONGRESS A MESSAGE](#)

[What are the GPO and WEP?](#)

[Coalition Partners](#)

[Congressional Leaders](#)

[2003 Supporters](#)
[-House](#)
[-Senate](#)

[2002 Supporters](#)

[History](#)

[How to Fix It](#)

[Impact on Education](#)

[Impact on Individuals](#)

[Non-Social Security States](#)

[Real Stories](#)

[Take the Quiz](#)

[Talking Points](#)

[Testimony Before Congress](#)

[What can I do?](#)

[Who is Affected](#)

Real Stories from Real People Affected by the GPO and WEP

I worked both as a teacher and as a Registered Nurse and I have paid fully and completely into both Social Security and my teacher's pension fund for retirement.

I will be penalized unjustly in my own Social Security benefit for having worked as a teacher. The offset is much greater when they take away your justly earned Social Security.

We need teachers and we need nurses. Must I live in poverty in my retirement because I worked hard in both these areas but will only be compensated for one?

- An educator from Texas

[Click here for next story](#)

[Click here to return to Real Stories from Real People](#)

nea | 1201 16TH STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20036
202.833.4000



Quick Links

[SEND
CONGRESS A
MESSAGE](#)

[What are the
GPO and WEP?](#)

[Coalition Partners](#)

[Congressional
Leaders](#)

[Current
Congressional
Supporters](#)

[Congressional
Supporters Last
Year](#)

[History](#)

[How to Fix It](#)

[Impact on
Education](#)

[Impact on
Individuals](#)

[Non-Social
Security States](#)

[Real Stories](#)

[Take the Quiz](#)

[Talking Points](#)

[Testimony Before
Congress](#)

[What can I do?](#)

[Who is Affected](#)

Real Stories from Real People Affected by the GPO and WEP

I have worked since 1961 including fifteen years in the private sector where the only retirement was Social Security. I also held summer jobs that required Social Security payments. For the past 14 years I have been teaching in public schools and participating in my state's retirement system.

Because of this I will not be allowed to receive my own Social Security. This is so unfair. I have paid into the system and now I will not be allowed to collect what belongs to me.

I have been advised to quit teaching and take another job, so that when I retire, I might get my teacher's pension and my Social Security. Is this fair when there is a teacher shortage and I love my job?

- An educator from California

[Click here for next story](#)

[Click here to return to Real Stories from Real People](#)

NEA ALASKA POSITION PAPER
HR 30 By Representative Gatto

When the state of Alaska opted out of Social Security in the early 1980's, members of the Public Employee's Retirement System (PERS) and the Teacher's Retirement System (TRS) no longer had to make Social Security contributions. However, many of the members of those systems have earned Social Security benefits through work in the private sector, in other retirement systems that did contribute to Social Security or through their spouses. However, due to two provisions of the Social Security Act, Alaskans will be unable to collect the Social Security benefits for which they have paid.

The Government Pension Offset affects the survivor's benefit that a spouse would receive upon the death of his or her spouse. In 90% of the cases where a spouse is due a survivor benefit, the spouse will receive nothing. The Windfall Elimination Provision affects the Social Security benefit that a member would receive through their earnings record by reducing the benefit, in most cases, by 60%. The only reason for these penalties is that Alaskan public employees and teachers belong to a retirement systems that don't contribute to Social Security.

Besides the affect of unfairly penalizing Alaska's public sector employees, the state of Alaska is being penalized. As the word gets out about the Social Security offsets, it becomes more difficult to recruit people from the private sector to become teachers. It also becomes more difficult to persuade potential employees to move from other states that do contribute to Social Security, as those employees do not want to jeopardize their earned benefits. We have even had teachers leave the state in order to protect their earned Social Security benefit.

Alaska is also penalized monetarily. With over 7000 affected retired PERS and TRS members and an unknown number of retired federal employees over the age of 65 the loss of income to the Alaskan economy runs into the millions. It is estimated that the average loss per member nationally is \$3600.

There is currently proposed legislation in the United States Congress to repeal these offsets with bipartisan support of over 300 congressmen and senators. NEA Alaska would appreciate your support for HR 30, urging our congressional delegation to voice Alaska's support for the repeal of these onerous Social Security offsets.

States in Which Public Employees are
Not Covered by Social Security

Alaska

Maine

California

Massachusetts

Colorado

Missouri

Connecticut

Nevada

Georgia (certain local
governments)

Ohio

Illinois

Rhode Island (certain local
governments)

Louisiana

Texas

Kentucky (certain local
governments)

The Government Pension Offset and Windfall Elimination Provision

What are the Government Pension Offset and Windfall Elimination Provision?

The Government Pension Offset (GPO) reduces public employees' Social Security spousal or survivor benefits by two-thirds of their public pension.

The Windfall Elimination Provision (WEP) reduces the earned Social Security benefits of an individual who also receives a public pension from a job not covered by Social Security.

Who do the GPO and WEP Affect?

The GPO affects people who work as federal, state, or local government employees, including educators, police officers, and firefighters, if the job is not covered by Social Security.

The WEP affects people who worked in jobs not covered by Social Security and in jobs in which they earned Social Security benefits – such as educators who do not earn Social Security in the public schools, but who work part-time or during the summer in jobs covered by Social Security. The WEP also affects people who move from a job in which they earn Social Security to a job, such as teaching, in which they do not.

The impact of the GPO and WEP is primarily felt in those states in which public employees like educators are not covered by Social Security (Alaska, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Georgia, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Missouri, Nevada, Ohio, Rhode Island, and Texas). However, because people move from state to state, there are affected individuals everywhere.

How do the GPO and WEP work?

The GPO reduces Social Security spousal or survivor benefits by two-thirds of the individual's public pension.

The WEP reduces the factor by which average earnings are multiplied to determine Social Security benefits. The amount of reduction depends on when the person retires and how many years of earnings he or she has accumulated.

What is the Impact of the GPO and WEP?

Estimates indicate that 9 out of 10 public employees affected by the GPO lose their entire spousal benefit, even though their deceased spouse paid Social Security taxes for many years. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the GPO reduces benefits for some 300,000 individuals by more than \$3,600 a year. The GPO has the harshest impact on those who can least afford the loss: lower-income women.

The WEP causes low-paid public employees outside the Social Security system, like educators, to lose up to sixty percent of their Social Security benefits. The WEP also impacts the teaching profession, as people are less likely to leave other careers, in which they earn Social Security benefits, to become educators.

What Can be Done to Address the GPO and WEP?

Congress can pass legislation to repeal the GPO and WEP. Representatives McKeon (R-CA) and Berman (D-CA) and Senators Feinstein (D-CA) have introduced bills (H.R. ~~5941~~ ~~5349~~) to repeal the GPO and WEP. *and Susan Collins (R-ME)*



Social Security Administration

SSA Publication No 05-10007

August 2000

(January 1999 edition may be used)

Government Pension Offset

A Law That Affects Spouse's Or Widow(er)'s Benefits

If you worked for a federal, state or local government where you did not pay Social Security taxes, the pension you receive from that agency may reduce any Social Security benefits for which you are qualified.

There are two laws that may reduce your benefits. One of them affects the way your Social Security retirement or disability benefits are figured. For more information about that provision, contact Social Security for the factsheet, *A Pension From Work Not Covered By Social Security* (Publication No. 05-10045).

The second law affects Social Security benefits you receive as a spouse or widow(er). This factsheet provides answers to questions you may have about this provision.

I Receive A Government Pension. Will I Receive Any Social Security On My Spouse's Record?

Maybe not. Some or all of your Social Security spouse's or widow(er)'s benefit may be offset if you receive a pension from a job where you did not pay Social Security taxes.

How Much Is The Offset?

The offset will reduce the amount of your Social Security spouse's or widow(er)'s benefits by two-thirds of the amount of your government pension. In other words, if you get a monthly civil service pension of \$600, two-thirds of that, or \$400, must be used to offset your Social Security spouse's or widow(er)'s benefits. If you're eligible for a \$500 widow(er)'s benefit, you'll receive \$100 per month from Social Security ($\$500 - \$400 = \$100$).

If you take your annuity in a lump sum, the offset is figured as if you chose to receive regular monthly benefits.

Why Is There An Offset?

Social Security spouse's benefits provide income to wives and husbands who have little or no Social Security benefits of their own. From the beginning of the Social Security program, spouse's benefits were intended for women and men who were financially dependent on their husbands or wives who worked at jobs covered by Social Security.

Before the offset provisions were enacted, many government employees qualified for a pension from their agency and for a spouse's benefit from Social Security, even though they were not dependent on their husbands or wives.

This example helps clarify why there is an offset.

Bill Smith collects a Social Security benefit of \$600 per month. His wife, Mary, is potentially eligible for a wife's benefit of up to 50 percent of Bill's, or \$300. However, Mary also worked and paid into Social Security, qualifying for her own retirement benefit of \$400. By law, Mary can only receive the higher of the two benefits she is eligible for, not both. She will not receive any wife's benefits because her \$400 retirement benefit, in effect, "offsets" her \$300 wife's benefit.

Bill's neighbor, Tom, also gets a Social Security benefit of \$600 per month. But his wife, Nancy, had a job with the federal government, instead of one where she paid Social Security taxes, and earned a civil service pension of \$800 per month. Before the government pension offset provisions were in place, Nancy would have been eligible for both her \$800 civil service pension and a \$300 wife's benefit on Tom's Social Security record. With the offset provision, Nancy does not qualify for a wife's benefit from Social Security and is treated the same as Mary.

Who Is Exempt?

- Any state, local or military service employee whose government pension is based on a job where he or she was paying Social Security taxes on the last day of employment. (Some government entities were not initially covered by Social Security, but chose to participate in Social Security at a later date.)
- Anyone whose government pension is not based on his or her own earnings.
- Anyone who received or who was eligible to receive a government pension before December 1982 and who meets all the requirements for Social Security spouse's benefits in effect in January 1977.
- Anyone who received or was eligible to receive a federal, state or local government pension before July 1, 1983, and was receiving one-half support from her or his spouse.
- Federal employees, including Civil Service Offset employees, who are mandatorily covered under Social Security. (Civil Service Offset employees are federal employees rehired after December 31, 1983, following a break in service of more than 365 days and who had five years of prior Civil Service Retirement System [CSRS] employment.)
- Federal employees who chose to switch from CSRS to the Federal Employees' Retirement System (FERS) on or before December 31, 1987, as well as those employees who were allowed to make a belated switch to FERS through June 30, 1988. Employees who switched outside of these periods, including those who switched during the open season from July 1, 1998 through December 31, 1998, need five years under FERS to be exempt from the government pension offset.

What About Medicare?

Even if you do not receive cash benefits on your spouse's record, you can still get Medicare at age 65.

Can I Still Get Benefits On My Own Record?

The offset applies only to Social Security benefits as a spouse or widow(er). However, your own benefits may be reduced due to another provision of the law. Contact Social Security for the factsheet, *A Pension From Work Not Covered By Social Security* (Publication No. 05-10045).

Any Questions?

Check our website at www.ssa.gov for answers to many of the questions you may have about Social Security. You also may call us toll-free at 1-800-772-1213. We can answer specific questions by phone from 7 a.m. until 7 p.m. on business days and provide information by automated phone service 24 hours a day. If you are deaf or hard of hearing, you may call our TTY number, 1-800-325-0778 between 7 a.m. and 7 p.m. on business days. We treat all calls confidentially—whether they're made to our toll-free numbers or to one of our local offices. We also want to make sure you receive accurate and courteous service. That's why we have a second Social Security representative monitor some incoming and outgoing telephone calls.

Social Security



The Windfall Elimination Provision How It Affects Your Social Security Retirement Or Disability Benefits

If you work for an employer who doesn't withhold Social Security taxes, such as a government agency or an employer in another country, the pension you get based on that work may reduce your Social Security benefits.

Your benefit can be reduced in one of two ways. One is the "government pension offset" and applies only if you receive a government pension and are eligible for Social Security benefits as a spouse or widow(er). For more information on the offset, ask Social Security for the factsheet, *Government Pension Offset* (Publication No. 05-10007).

The other way—the "windfall elimination provision"—affects how your retirement or disability benefits are figured if you receive a pension from work not covered by Social Security. The formula used to figure your benefit amount is modified, giving you a lower Social Security benefit. This factsheet explains the formula.

Who Is Affected?

The windfall elimination provision primarily affects people who earned a pension from working for a government agency and also worked at other jobs where they paid Social Security taxes long enough to qualify for retirement or disability benefits. It also may affect you if you earned a pension in any job where you didn't pay Social Security taxes, such as in a foreign country.

The modified formula applies to you if you reach 62 or become disabled after 1985 and first become eligible after 1985 for a monthly pension based in whole or in part on work, where you did not pay Social Security taxes. You're considered eligible for a pension if you meet the pension requirements, even if you continue to work.

An important point: The windfall elimination provision affects Social Security benefits when any part of a person's federal service after 1956 is covered only under Civil Service Retirement System (CSRS) deductions. However, federal service where Social Security taxes are withheld (Federal Employee Retirement System or CSRS Offset) do not reduce Social Security benefit amounts.

The modified formula is used to figure your Social Security benefit beginning with the first month you get both a Social Security benefit and the other pension.

Why Is A Different Formula Used?

The modified formula prevents a windfall to people who would unfairly benefit from provisions aimed at low-income workers. Social Security benefits replace a percentage of a worker's pre-retirement earnings and the benefit computation formula includes factors that make sure lower-paid workers get a higher return than highly paid workers. For example, lower-paid workers could get a Social Security benefit that equals about 60 percent of their pre-retirement earnings. The average replacement rate for highly paid workers is about 25 percent.

Before 1983, people who worked in jobs not covered by Social Security received benefits that were computed as if they were long-term, low-wage workers. They received the advantage of higher percentage benefits in addition to their other pension. The modified formula eliminates this windfall.

How Does It Work?

Social Security benefits are based on the worker's average monthly earnings adjusted for inflation. We separate your average earnings into three amounts and multiply the amounts using three factors. For example, for a worker who turns 62 in 2001, the first \$561 of average monthly earnings is multiplied by 90 percent; the next \$2,820 by 32 percent; and the remainder by 15 percent.

The 90 percent factor is reduced in the modified formula and phased in for workers who reached age 62 or became disabled between 1986 and 1989. For those who reach 62 or become disabled in 1990 or later, the 90 percent factor is reduced to 40 percent.

There are exceptions to this rule. For example, the 90 percent factor is not reduced if you have 30 or more years of "substantial" earnings in a job where you paid Social Security taxes. See the table on the back that lists the amount of "substantial" earnings for each year.

If you have 21 to 29 years of substantial earnings, the 90 percent factor is reduced to between 45 and 85 percent. The second table shows the percentage used depending on the number of years of "substantial" earnings.

Year	Substantial Earnings
1937-50	\$ 900 ¹
1951-54	900
1955-58	1,050
1959-65	1,200
1966-67	1,650
1968-71	1,950
1972	2,250
1973	2,700
1974	3,300
1975	3,525
1976	3,825
1977	4,125
1978	4,425
1979	4,725
1980	5,100
1981	5,550
1982	6,075
1983	6,675
1984	7,050
1985	7,425
1986	7,875
1987	8,175
1988	8,400
1989	8,925
1990	9,525
1991	9,900
1992	10,350
1993	10,725
1994	11,250
1995	11,325
1996	11,625
1997	12,150
1998	12,675
1999	13,425
2000	14,175
2001	14,925

¹Credited earnings from 1937-50 are divided by \$900 to get the years of coverage (maximum 14 years).

Years of Substantial Earnings	Percentage
30 or more	90 percent
29	85 percent
28	80 percent
27	75 percent
26	70 percent
25	65 percent
24	60 percent
23	55 percent
22	50 percent
21	45 percent
20 or less	40 percent

Some Exceptions

The modified formula does not apply to survivors benefits. It also does not apply to you if:

- you are a federal worker first hired after December 31, 1983;
- you were employed on December 31, 1983 by a nonprofit organization that was exempt from Social Security and it became mandatorily covered under Social Security on that date;
- your only pension is based on railroad employment;
- your only work where you did not pay Social Security taxes was before 1957; or
- you have 30 or more years of substantial earnings under Social Security.

Guarantee

Workers with relatively low pensions are protected because the reduction in the Social Security benefit under the modified formula cannot be more than one-half of that part of the pension attributable to earnings after 1956 not covered by Social Security.

For More Information

Visit www.ssa.gov for more Social Security information. You also can get recorded information 24 hours a day, including weekends and holidays, by calling 1-800-772-1213. You can speak to a service representative between 7 a.m. and 7 p.m. on business days. Our lines are busiest early in the week and early in the month, so, if your business can wait, it's best to call at other times. Whenever you call, have your Social Security number handy.

People who are deaf or hard of hearing may call our toll-free TTY number, 1-800-325-0778, between 7 a.m. and 7 p.m. on business days.

We treat all calls confidentially. We also want to make sure that you receive accurate and courteous service. That's why we have a second Social Security representative monitor some incoming and outgoing telephone calls.

Social Security Administration
SSA Publication No. 05-10045
July 2001 (*Recycle prior editions*)
ICN 460275
Unit of Issue: HD (one hundred)

ISSUE: SOCIAL SECURITY GOVERNMENT PENSION OFFSET (GPO)

Legislation was enacted in 1977 to prevent government retirees from collecting both a government annuity based on their own work in non-social security covered employment and social security benefits based on their spouse's work record. The new law became effective with government employees who were first eligible to retire in December 1982 and later. The law provides that two-thirds of the government annuity offsets whatever social security benefits would be payable to the retired government worker as a spouse (wife, husband, widow, widower) For example, a spouse who receives a civil service benefit of \$900 a month based on his/her own earnings applies for a social security widow(er)'s benefit. The widow(er)'s benefit is \$500. Two-thirds of his/her annuity, or \$600, totally offsets the social security widow(er)'s benefit. He/She, therefore, receives no widow(er)'s benefit from social security.

There are approximately 335,000 beneficiaries currently affected by the GPO and that number grows by about 15,000 annually. The GPO affects thousands of state and municipal workers, as well as teachers and other school district employees whose work is not covered by Social Security.

The GPO does not apply to survivor annuitants who are not government retirees themselves. There are other exceptions. They are as follows:

- Anyone eligible for a government annuity before December 1982, and who meets the 1977 law requirements (a divorced woman's marriage must have lasted 20 years; a husband or widower must have been receiving one-half support from the wife).
- Anyone who is receiving only a federal survivor annuity and not their own federal retiree annuity. Neither the survivor annuitant's own Social Security nor the widow's benefit from the husband's Social Security is affected.
- Anyone eligible for a government annuity before July 1, 1983, and who received one-half support from the male or female spouse.
- Federal Employees Retirement System (FERS) employees and annuitants, and former Civil Service Retirement System (CSRS) annuitants who transferred to FERS.
- Former CSRS employees rehired beginning January 1, 1984, following a separation of one year or more, are also exempt.
- Effective January 1, 1995, the GPO does not apply to military reserve pensions.
- Anyone over the age of 65, still working for the federal government. The GPO will not become effective until the person retires and begins to receive a CSRS annuity.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

There have been various Social Security Government Pension Offset (GPO) bills introduced in Congress for more than ten years.

Congressman William Jefferson (D-LA) introduced his GPO bill, H.R. 887, on February 25, 2003 with bipartisan cosponsorship of 97 Representatives. It proposes that the two-thirds offset not be applied unless the total of both the Social Security spousal benefit and the government pension exceed \$2,000 per month. Senator Barbara Mikulski (D-MD) introduced her GPO bill in the Senate, S. 363, on February 11, 2003, with original cosponsorship from 12 Senators. Congressman Howard "Buck" McKeon (R-CA) introduced a bill that would repeal both the GPO and the Windfall Elimination Provision (WEP), H.R. 594, on February 5, 2003, with 91 Representatives as original cosponsors. Senator Dianne Feinstein (D-CA) introduced her companion GPO/WEP repeal bill in the Senate, S. 349, on February 11, 2003, with 8 original cosponsors. Congressman E. Clay Shaw (R-FL), Chairman of the House Ways and Means Social Security Subcommittee, introduced H.R. 75, on January 7, 2003 with 4 original cosponsors, as a "Social Security Reform" bill, which includes a provision to modify the GPO. Section 207 of that bill proposes reducing the GPO from a two-thirds offset to a one-third offset.

Social Security actuaries have determined that the enactment of the Mikulski GPO modification proposal would increase the OASDI long-range actuarial deficit by an estimated 0.01 percent of taxable payroll. Social Security actuaries have also determined that the enactment of the Shaw GPO reform proposal would increase the OASDI long-range actuarial deficit by approximately 0.02 percent of taxable payroll. Social Security actuaries have determined that the enactment of the combined GPO/WEP repeal proposal would increase the OASDI long-range actuarial deficit by an estimated 0.11 percent of taxable payroll. There has not been an actuarial determination, to date, on the Jefferson proposal, which now has a \$2,000 threshold before the GPO would apply, instead of the previous \$1,200 threshold.

TALKING POINTS for the SOCIAL SECURITY GOVERNMENT PENSION OFFSET (GPO)

Present law prevents government retirees (who were first eligible to retire in December 1982 and later) from collecting both a government annuity based on their own work and Social Security benefits based on their spouse's work record.

This law provides that two-thirds of the government annuity offsets whatever Social Security benefits would be payable to the retired government worker as a spouse (wife, husband, widow, etc.).

A federal retiree with a monthly annuity of \$900 and no Social Security coverage of her own would receive a greatly reduced widow's benefit from the program on the death of her husband as a result of GPO.

Example: the husband, a private-sector retiree, received a \$1,100 monthly Social Security benefit. A spouse who worked in the private sector would be entitled to receive this entire \$1,100 per month benefit. However, because the widow is a federal annuitant, she will receive only \$500 a month from Social Security, since two-thirds of her own \$900 annuity -- \$600 -- offsets the \$1,100.

The Government Pension Offset most drastically affects low-income widows.

Action Requested: Legislation to eliminate the GPO, as well as the Windfall Elimination Provision (WEP), has been introduced in the House, by Congressman Howard "Buck" McKeon (R-CA) as **H.R. 594** (staff contact: Kurt Courtney 202/225-1956). Senator Dianne Feinstein (D-CA) has introduced the GPO/WEP repeal companion bill, **S.349**, in the Senate, (staff contact: Michael Schiffer 202/224-3841). Ask your Representative and Senators to cosponsor and push for passage of the above referenced bills.

SOCIAL SECURITY
GOVERNMENT PENSION OFFSET
(GPO)

WHO IS AFFECTED?

**GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES FIRST ELIGIBLE TO
RETIRE DECEMBER 1982 OR LATER.**

HOW MANY ARE AFFECTED?

**335,000 SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFICIARIES
APPROXIMATELY 15,000 MORE EACH YEAR**

HOW ARE THEY AFFECTED?

**SOCIAL SECURITY SPOUSAL BENEFIT (WIFE,
HUSBAND, WIDOW, OR WIDOWER) IS OFFSET
BY TWO-THIRDS OF THE ANNUITANT'S OWN
GOVERNMENT ANNUITY – THIS CAN REDUCE
OR ELIMINATE THE SOCIAL SECURITY
BENEFIT**

ISSUE: SOCIAL SECURITY WINDFALL ELIMINATION PROVISION (WEP)

The Social Security Amendments of 1983 include a provision that greatly reduces the social security benefit of a retired or disabled worker who also receives a government annuity based on his/her own earnings. It applies to anyone who becomes 62 (or disabled) after 1985 and becomes eligible for his/her government annuity after 1985. Both must occur after 1985. Congress provided for a five-year phase-in on the reduction so that the maximum effect would not be felt until 1990. Those who became 62 in 1990 or reached that age after 1990 (and were not eligible for a federal annuity until after 1985), may have their social security benefit decreased by as much as 60%. An additional 20% is deducted for taking the benefit at age 62.

There are approximately 635,000 beneficiaries currently affected by the WEP, and that number grows by about 60,000 annually.

There are several exceptions to the Windfall Elimination Provision. They are as follows:

- Anyone eligible to retire before January 1, 1986 or who became 62 or disabled before 1986.
- Anyone who has 30 or more years of substantial earnings under Social Security.
- Anyone who is a federal survivor annuitant. The survivor annuitant's own Social Security is not affected.
- Anyone whose only pension from non-covered employment is based on Railroad Retirement-covered work.
- An individual whose pension is based only on non-covered employment before 1957.
- Any federal worker first hired after December 31, 1983, or a federal worker performing service January 1, 1984 who became mandatorily covered under Social Security January 1, 1984.
- Anyone employed December 31, 1983 by a non-profit organization that became mandatorily covered under Social Security on that date.
- Anyone over the age of 65, still working for the federal government. The WEP will not become effective until the person retires and begins to receive an annuity.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Windfall Elimination Provision (WEP) reform and repeal bills have been introduced in past Congresses. Among those who have advocated a change in the WEP in the past have been Rep. Barney Frank (D-MA) and Rep. Max Sandlin (D-TX). Frank introduced a WEP reform bill exempting retirees whose combined Social Security and public pension benefits are less than \$2,000 a month. The WEP would gradually phase in for those receiving combined benefits between \$2,000 and \$3,000 per month, while those receiving more than \$3,000 per month would still be fully affected by the WEP. Sandlin sponsored a WEP repeal bill.

In the 108th Congress, Rep. Howard "Buck" McKeon (R-CA) has introduced a bill that would repeal the GPO and the WEP, H.R. 594, on February 5, 2003, with 91 original cosponsors. Senator Dianne Feinstein (D-CA) introduced her companion GPO/WEP repeal bill in the Senate, S. 349, on February 11, 2003, with 8 original cosponsors.

Social Security actuaries have determined that the enactment of the WEP reform proposal would increase the OASDI long-range actuarial deficit by an estimated 0.01 percent of taxable payroll. Social Security actuaries have determined that the enactment of the WEP repeal proposal would increase the OASDI long-range actuarial deficit by an estimated 0.05 percent of taxable payroll. Social Security actuaries have determined that the enactment of the combined GPO/WEP repeal proposal would increase the OASDI long-range actuarial deficit by an estimated 0.11 percent of taxable payroll.

TALKING POINTS for the SOCIAL SECURITY WINDFALL ELIMINATION PROVISION (WEP)

Present law greatly reduces the Social Security benefit of a retired or disabled worker who also receives a government annuity based on his/her own earnings.

It applies to anyone who becomes 62 (or disabled) after 1985 and becomes eligible for her/his government annuity after 1985.

This windfall reduction can reduce the worker's earned Social Security benefit by as much as 60 percent.

For example, an annuitant with 30 years of federal service could receive a monthly benefit of \$405 based on the formula used by Social Security. However, since this annuitant falls under the Windfall Elimination Provision, her month Social Security benefit is cut to \$180.

Action Requested: Legislation to eliminate the Windfall Elimination Provision (WEP), as well as the Government Pension Offset (GPO), has been introduced in the House, by Congressman Howard "Buck" McKeon (R-CA) as **H.R. 594** (staff contact: Kurt Courtney 202/225-1956). Senator Dianne Feinstein (D-CA) has introduced the WEP repeal companion bill, **S.349**, in the Senate, (staff contact: Michael Schiffer 202/224-3841). Ask your Representative and Senators to cosponsor and push for passage of the above referenced bills.

SOCIAL SECURITY
WINDFALL ELIMINATION PROVISION
(WEP)

WHO IS AFFECTED?

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES FIRST ELIGIBLE TO
RETIRE AFTER 1985 AND WHO BECAME 62 OR
DISABLED AFTER 1985

HOW MANY ARE AFFECTED?

- 635,000 SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFICIARIES
- APPROXIMATELY 60,000 MORE EACH YEAR

HOW ARE THEY AFFECTED?

WEP REDUCES A PERSON'S OWN EARNED
SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFIT BY USING A
COMPUTATION FORMULA.

IT CAN RESULT IN A LOSS OF AS MUCH AS 60%
OF THE PERSON'S SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFIT,
TO A MAXIMUM OF \$301.

HJR

31

HOUSE COMMITTEE REPORT

(7)

Date Referred to Committee: February 19, 2004

FURTHER REFERRALS: Judiciary
Finance

Date of Committee Action: March 27, 2004

The STATE AFFAIRS Committee considered:

HJR 31

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 31

CONST AM: PERMANENT FUND

Proposing amendments to the Constitution of the State of Alaska relating to the Alaska permanent fund and to payments to certain state residents from the Alaska permanent fund; and providing for an effective date for the amendments.

Recommends it be replaced with HCS or CS for HJR 31 (STA)
For Senate Bills with new title: Technical Title New Title: HCR _____ Same Title New Title

- attach amendments
- add new referral to _____ Committee
- Letter of Intent _____ Committee

List of Abbrev for Depts.:

- ADM
- CED
- COR
- CRT
- EED
- DEC
- DFG
- GOV
- HSS
- LEG
- LAW
- LWF
- MVA
- DNR
- DPS
- REV
- DOT
- UA

NEW FISCAL NOTES				
*Assigned by Chief Clerk's Office				
List by Dept(s):	*FN#	Fiscal	Indet.	Zero
HSS		✓		
HSS		✓		
HSS		✓		
HSS		✓		
HSS		✓		
HSS		✓		
HSS		✓		
HSS		✓		
HSS		✓		
HSS		✓		
LAW		✓		
DPS		✓		
REV		✓		
REV		✓		

PREVIOUS FISCAL NOTES				
List by Dept(s):	FN#	Fiscal	Indet.	Zero
LWF	1			✓
GOV	2	✓		
EED	3	✓		
REV	4	✓		
REV	5	✓		

Signing with recommendations	Printed Last Name	DP	DNP	NR	AM
<i>Paul Seaton</i>	Seaton		✓		
<i>Mark Lundenberg</i>	Lundenberg		✓		
<i>John Holm</i>	HOLM	✓			
<i>Lynn Coghill</i>	LYNN			X	
<i>Barbara Berkowitz</i>	Berkowitz		✓		
Chair: <i>B. Weybrauch</i>	Weybrauch	X			
Chair:					

Amendment #1

#1

Proposed Amendment for
HJR31

Pg. 2, line 12, after the word "dividend." Insert: **Payments under this subsection shall be distributed by April 1, 2005.**

This amendment is a practical fix to the problem of moving billions of dollars out of the market and other investments of the fund without negative effects to the fund value or the markets. The Fund managers have said that this date will be sufficient.

#2

23-LS1282\W.1
Cook
3/23/04

AMENDMENT

OFFERED IN THE HOUSE

BY REPRESENTATIVE HOLM

TO: CSHJR 31(W&M)

- 1 Page 2, line 12, following "²⁰⁰⁵~~dividend~~":
- 2 Insert ", unless a written rejection of the payment is provided to the State"

FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA
2004 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Fiscal Note Number: _____
Bill Version: HJR31CS(W&M)-DHSS-DPA1-03-18-04
() Publish Date: _____

Revision Date/Time (Note if correction): _____

Dept. Affected: Health & Social Services

Title CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT ON PERMANENT FUND

RDU Public Assistance

Component ATAP

Sponsor HOLM

Requester HOUSE (STA)

Component No. 220

Expenditures/Revenues

(Thousands of Dollars)

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

OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010
Personal Services						
Travel						
Contractual						
Supplies						
Equipment						
Land & Structures						
Grants & Claims	(26,423.1)	17,615.4	8,807.7			
Miscellaneous						
TOTAL OPERATING	(26,423.1)	17,615.4	8,807.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
CAPITAL EXPENDITURES						
CHANGE IN REVENUES (0)						

FUND SOURCE

(Thousands of Dollars)

1002 Federal Receipts	(16,619.8)	7,812.1	8,807.7			
1003 GF Match	(6,867.4)	6,867.4				
1004 GF		2,935.9				
1037 GF/Mental Health						
1007 Interagency Receipts	(2,935.9)					
Other(Specify Type-do not abbreviate)						
TOTAL	(26,423.1)	17,615.4	8,807.7	0.0	0.0	0.0

Estimate of any current year (FY2004) cost: _____

Mark this box (X) if funding for this bill is included in the Governor's FY 2004 budget proposal:

POSITIONS

Full-time						
Part-time						
Temporary						

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary)

HJR 31 proposes an amendment to the Alaska State Constitution to provide a one-time \$20,000 supplemental PFD payment, then eliminates the PFD program.

The bill also eliminates PFD hold harmless protection for individuals and families receiving public assistance benefits. The department would be required to count the PFD as income when determining eligibility for ATAP.

Approximately 4,600 of 5,000 families will receive a dividend and lose ATAP benefits in that month. Because of the large supplemental PFD payment, we assume these families would also lose eligibility for 11 additional months when the portion of the PFD retained would be counted as a resource.

con't next page.

Prepared by: Angela Salerno
Division: Public Assistance
Approved by: Joel S. Gilbertson, Commissioner
Agency: Department of Health and Social Services

Phone 465-3200
Date/Time 03/16/2004
Date 03/18/2004

FISCAL NOTE
FN #

STATE OF ALASKA
2004 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL NO. HJR31CS(W&M)-DHSS-DPA1-03-18-04

ANALYSIS CONTINUATION

While we assume 11 additional months of ineligibility, several factors could contribute to a typical ATAP family (one adult, two children) "spending down" their resources rapidly:

- the family will pay federal taxes of approx. 15% on the dividend;
- support services such as childcare benefits and food stamps will no longer be available adding significant costs to the family's budget;
- families will also lose Medicaid and will have to pay all health care costs incurred;
- extra resources will be used to pay off family debt. Research done by DPA shows that 40% of families leaving ATAP have debts for which their PFD has been garnished.

Distribution of a \$20,000 PFD in FY 95 results in one-time savings in ATAP and Tribal Assistance that include reductions in GF MOE for TANF. These reductions in GF MOE are moved and spent in Work Services to support TANF employment-oriented services. This action is required to avoid falling out of compliance with federal "maintenance of effort" MOE requirements. Alaska is already at its "75% MOE floor" and a reduction in GF MOE expenditure would result in severe federal financing penalties.

The fiscal note financial summary on page 1 shows the projected one-time savings in FY2005. FY2006 reflects that this amount would have to be added back in FY2006, partially offset by continued savings. In FY2007, the funding to replace FY2006 savings would have to be added back into the budget. This would bring the program back to the base funding level with no further changes to that base funding in FY2008-2010. This is detailed in the table shown on page 3.

In addition, the financial summary reflects that there is a switch in funding source from Interagency Receipts (from the PFD Hold Harmless component) to General Funds for benefit payments in FY2006 and all future years. PFD hold harmless revenue has been a funding source for public assistance programs since 1982. Ending the PFD program will also end the hold harmless program. When recipients regain eligibility, benefits once paid with PFD hold harmless money will be replaced by GF.

SEE NEXT PAGE

FISCAL NOTE
FN #

STATE OF ALASKA
2004 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL NO. HJR31CS(W&M)-DHSS-DPA1-03-18-04

ANALYSIS CONTINUATION

	FY2005	FY2006	FY2007	Total
<u>One-time ATAP Savings</u>				
Month PFD Received (October)				
Family ineligible over income	(2,935.9)			
Months following Receipt (Nov-Jun 05)				
Family ineligible over resource	(23,487.2)			
Months following Receipt (Jul-Sept 05)	-	(8,807.7)	-	
Total One-time Savings	(26,423.1)	(8,807.7)		(35,230.8)

Restore ATAP Payments

One year later no new PFD and most families
have spent the PFD

Months eligibility returns (Oct-June06)				
Restore one-time savings		26,423.1		
Months eligibility returns (Jul-Sep)				
Restore one-time savings	-	-	8,807.7	
Formula ATAP funding restored	-	26,423.1	8,807.7	35,230.8

FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA
2003 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Fiscal Note Number: _____
 Bill Version: CS HJR31 (W M)
 () Publish Date: _____
 Dept. Affected: Health & Social Services
 RDU Public Assistance
 Component Adult Public Assistance

Revision Date/Time (Note if correction): _____
 Title CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT ON PERMANENT FUND
 Sponsor HOLM
 Requester HOUSE (STA)

Component No. 222

Expenditures/Revenues (Thousands of Dollars)

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

OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010
Personal Services						
Travel						
Contractual						
Supplies						
Equipment						
Land & Structures						
Grants & Claims	(15,169.2)	15,169.2				
Miscellaneous						
TOTAL OPERATING	(15,169.2)	15,169.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
CAPITAL EXPENDITURES						
CHANGE IN REVENUES (0)						

FUND SOURCE (Thousands of Dollars)

1002 Federal Receipts						
1003 GF Match	(11,376.9)	11,376.9				
1004 GF		3,792.3				
1037 GF/Mental Health						
1007 Interagency Receipts	(3,792.3)					
Other(Specify Type-do not abbreviate)						
TOTAL	(15,169.2)	15,169.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Estimate of any current year (FY2004) cost: _____

Mark this box (X) if funding for this bill is included in the Governor's FY 2005 budget proposal:

POSITIONS

Full-time						
Part-time						
Temporary						

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary)

HJR 31 proposes an amendment to the Alaska State Constitution to provide a one time \$20,000 supplemental PFD payment, then eliminates the PFD program. The bill also eliminates the PFD hold harmless program for individuals and families receiving public assistance benefits. The department would be required to count the PFD as income when determining eligibility for Adult Public Assistance (APA). Approximately 14,600 of the 15,800 individuals receiving APA will lose APA as well as federal SSI benefits in the month they receive the PFD. Because of the large supplemental PFD payment, we assume they would also lose eligibility for three additional months in which PFD income would be counted as a resource.

con't. next page

Prepared by: Angela Salerno
 Division Public Assistance
 Approved by: _____
 Agency Department of Health and Social Services

Phone 455-3200
 Date/Time 03/18/2004
 Date 03/18/2004

FISCAL NOTE

FN #

STATE OF ALASKA
2003 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL NO.CS HJR31 (W M)

ANALYSIS CONTINUATION

The fiscal note financial summary on page 1 shows the projected one-time savings in FY2005. FY2006 reflects that this amount would have to be added back in FY2006, partially offset by continued savings. In FY2007, the funding to replace FY2006 savings would have to be added back into the budget. This would bring the program back to the base funding level with no further changes to that base funding in FY2008-2010. This is detailed in the table shown below.

In addition, the financial summary reflects that there is a switch in funding source from Interagency Receipts (from the PFD Hold Harmless component) to General Funds for benefit payments in FY2006 and all future years. PFD hold harmless revenue has been a funding source for public assistance programs since 1982. Ending the PFD program will also end the hold harmless program. When recipients regain eligibility, benefits once paid with PFD hold harmless money will be replaced by GF.

	<u>FY2005</u>	<u>FY2006</u>	<u>FY2007</u>	Total
<u>One-time APA Savings</u>				
Month PFD Received (October)				
Individuals ineligible over income	(3,792.3)			
Months following Receipt (Nov-Jan 05)				
Individuals ineligible over resource	(11,376.9)			
	-	-	-	
Total One-time Savings	(15,169.2)	-		(15,169.2)
 <u>Restore APA Payments (following year)</u>				
In FY06 no new PFD and Disabled Aged recipients have spent the PFD				
Months eligibility returns (Oct-Jan compared to PY05)				
Formula APA funding restored	-	15,169.5	-	15,169.5

FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA
2003 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Fiscal Note Number: _____
 Bill Version: CS HJR31 (W M)
 () Publish Date: _____
 Dept. Affected: Health & Social Services
 RDU Public Assistance
 Component PFD Hold Harmless

Revision Date/Time (Note if correction): _____
 Title CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT ON PERMANENT FUND

Sponsor HOLM
 Requester HOUSE (STA)

Component No. 225

Expenditures/Revenues (Thousands of Dollars)

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

OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010
Personal Services						
Travel						
Contractual						
Supplies						
Equipment						
Land & Structures						
Grants & Claims	(15,495.0)					
Miscellaneous						
TOTAL OPERATING	(15,495.0)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES						
CHANGE IN REVENUES (0)						

FUND SOURCE (Thousands of Dollars)

1002 Federal Receipts						
1003 GF Match						
1004 GF						
1037 GF/Mental Health						
1050 PFD Fund	(15,495.0)					
Other(Specify Type-do not abbreviate)						
TOTAL	(15,495.0)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Estimate of any current year (FY2004) cost: _____

Mark this box (X) if funding for this bill is included in the Governor's FY 2005 budget proposal:

POSITIONS

Full-time						
Part-time						
Temporary						

ANALYSIS:

(Attach a separate page if necessary)

The PFD Hold Harmless program (PFD-HH) replaces public assistance benefits lost because federal rules require that the PFD be counted as income for program eligibility purposes. HJR 31 eliminates PFD-HH protection for individuals who lose eligibility for ATAP, tribal assistance (NFAP), food stamps, APA and federal SSI benefits. These individuals and families would be ineligible for benefits in the month they receive the PFD. We assume recipients will continue to be ineligible for additional months because any PFD income retained must be counted as a resource. We assume APA and SSI recipients would lose benefits for three additional months, recipients of other programs will lose benefits for an additional 11 because of the \$20,000 supplemental payment.

see next page

Prepared by: Angela Salerno
 Division: Public Assistance
 Approved by: Elmer A. Lindstrom, Special Assistant to the Commissioner
 Agency: Department of Health and Social Services

Phone 465-3200
 Date/Time 03/18/2004
 Date 03/18/2004

FISCAL NOTE

FN #

STATE OF ALASKA
2003 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL NO. CS HJR31 (W M)

ANALYSIS CONTINUATION

Savings to the PFD-HH fund are as follows:

ATAP:	(\$2,935,900)
NFAP:	(676,700)
FS:	(5,047,000)
APA:	(3,792,300)
SSI:	<u>(3,043,000)</u>
Total	(\$15,494,900)

PFD hold harmless revenue has been a revenue source for public assistance programs since 1982. Loss of this funding source will result in cost-shifting of \$6.4 million to the state GF. This funding switch is shown on the fiscal notes for the ATAP, APA and Tribal Assistance components. The SSI and Foodstamp costs previously paid by PFD Hold Harmless funding will revert to Federal benefit payments.