

SB-529 Am

COMMITTEE REPORT

HOUSE

4/1/76

FINANCE

Mr. Speaker:

Date

4-27-76

COMMUNITY AND REGIONAL

The Committee on

AFFAIRS

has had

SB 529

under consideration. A Majority of the members of the Committee

() recommends it DO PASS

() recommends it DO NOT PASS

() recommends it DO PASS WITH ATTACHED AMENDMENT(S)

() recommends it BE REPLACED WITH CS FOR SB 507 AND THAT

CS FOR SB 5-1 DO PASS

() "and" recommends it BE REFERRED TO THE _____

COMMITTEE

() reports it back WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION

() "other"

Members signing the Majority report:

<u>Sam C. Otter</u>	_____	_____
<u>Al Casper</u>	_____	_____
<u>Sam Lockman</u>	_____	_____ <u>Ridd</u>
<u>Pat Keyser</u>	_____	_____

Members NOT concurring in the Majority report:

_____ recommends:

_____ recommends:

_____ recommends:

_____ recommends:

_____ recommends:

Sam C. Otter Chairman

HOUSE COMMUNITY & REGIONAL AFFAIRS

April 9, 1976

The meeting was called to order at 9:05 am by Chairman Cotten for discussion of SB 551, SB 529, HB's 656 and 657. Present were:

Rep. Cotten
Rep. Ose
Rep. Freeman
Rep. Kelley
Rep. Hackney
Rep. Davis

Rep. Ostrosky
Don Berry, Alaska Municipal League
Palmer Mc Carter, C&RA
Barbara Englert Thomas, Staff
Vicci Hansen, Staff

- 0009 Chairman Cotten explained SB 551. Since Anchorage unified it didn't automatically come under the Social Security Act and apparently it appears that unless municipal employees are covered under Title II of the Social Security Act, they don't qualify for state PERS so the procedure is for them to have a vote on an individual basis to find out if they want to.
- 0058 Don Berry pointed out that on February 17th the House passed HB 569, 35-0 and this bill is identical to SB 551.
- 0079 Rep Freeman asked to vote the bill out.
- 0110 Palmer McCarter gave a run-down on SB 529. Sections 1 and 2 were in the Governors bill and basically they consider that part to be part of a clean up of existing language. There would be the possibility under Section 1 where a borough could apply under the state for monies that the state says could be exempted to certain individuals without actually having given the exemption to the person. That part is a clean-up. Also, Section 2 they consider a clean-up.
- 0145 Cotten asked McCarter if the problem was that they had a \$10,000.00 exemption and so the state was paying the borough for revenue that they really hadn't lost.
- McCarter said yes.
- Cotten said that confused him.
- McCarter explained this. There basically is really no objection to either Section 1 or 2. Those are amendments that were proposed by the state assessor. Section 3 additionally had some language in it that the state assessor felt should have been left in and McCarter suspects that the committee members do not have the original bill but he explained this part.
- 0368 McCarter discussed the bill with the committee and said that it would have helped to have Bob Dozier present.
- 0425 Rep. Ose stated that this exemption leaves it wide open for the food stampers and so forth and an honest farmer has a tough time. He stated examples of this in his area.

There was further discussion on the bill.

0540

Rep. Ose said that he would like to have some people come in and discuss the other end of this. Cotten said he have it Wednesday.

0544

Cotten then discussed HB 657, Planning, Platting and Zoning. Gene Hines testified on this. He said that there are some reservations about this bill. He listened to the people representing the Administration and he feels it has much more effect than what they testified to. This was first brought to their attention when they got a copy of unorganized borough zoning regulations put out by administration before the session started. He read portions of those regulations. The committee is to have copies of this letter and regulations. He felt that it should be stopped right now before a lot of money is spent if the committee doesn't approve of it.

Cotten said that it was a serious question.

He said that this should be resolved by the legislature and not by a single committee since it takes in quite a bit of scope. He will have a legal interpretation presented to the committee on this.

0857

Cotten asked the committee what they wanted to do with HB 656. He told the committee what the bill was briefly about.

There was discussion on the bill. He asked if someone would like to make a motion to pass the bill out.

0940

Ostrosky said that she moved to pass the bill out

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 am.

*

FROM PB2V TO PB2H

*

CUTTEN

PRIME SPONSOR SUMMARY

09:42

4/26/76

PAGE 1 OF 4

BILL #

ABBREVIATED TITLE

CURRENT STATUS

DATE

BILL #	ABBREVIATED TITLE	CURRENT STATUS	DATE
HB 100	ORGANIZATION GRANTS TO CITY AND BUROUGH	IN (H) FINANCE	2/06/75
HB 101	APPROPRIATION TO DEPT C&RA; ANCH; EAGLE RIV	IN (H) C&RA	1/29/75
HB 109	SUPPL APPROPRIATION TO DEPT C&RA; EAGLE RIV	CHAPTER 0022 SLA 75	3/31/75
HB 110	SUPPL APPROPRIATION TO DEPT C&RA; EAGLE RIV	IN (H) C&RA	1/31/75
HB 204	TIME FOR OPENING AND CLOSING THE PULLS	IN (H) STATE APP.	2/25/75
HB 466	FINANCIAL ASSIST TO OIL IMPACT AREAS	IN (H) FINANCE	5/01/75
HB 469	STATE PAYMENT TO CITY OR BUROUGH: ROAD MAIN	IN (H) C&RA	5/01/75
HB 501	APPROPRIATION TO DEPT H&SS; RELOCATE PRISON	IN (H) FINANCE	5/20/75
HB 648	PAYMENT OF WAGES IN THE STATE	IN (S) RULES	4/08/76
HB 687	STATE AID TO UNIFIED LOCAL GOVERNMENTS	PASSED (H)	4/23/76
HB 775	UNLAWFUL ABSENCE FROM CUSTODY OR CONFINEMENT	IN (S) JUDICIARY	4/12/76
HJR 67	RELATING TO CHUGIAK-EAGLE RIVER AREA	READ BY GOVERNOR	5/31/75
HJR 27	COST-OF-LIVING ALLOWANCE FOR FEDERAL EMPLOY	READ BY GOVERNOR	5/13/75
***	***	***	***

Order by Code Business Forms, Inc.

Section 3 of this bill provides for the filing of a lien contemporaneously with the payment of the reimbursement to the municipality. We believe that a lien will be largely self-executing in effect.

Section 3 also makes clear that the farm-property owner who eventually sells the property for a non-farm use after, for example, 50 years of farm use and farm assessment is liable to the State for only seven years of reimbursement -- not the full 50 years. This is presently implied in the third sentence of AS 29.53.035(a), and the amendment of the fourth sentence clarifies the point. Section 3 is made retroactive to January 1, 1975 to coincide with the first year of operation under ch. 90 SLA 1974's revision of the farm-use assessment provisions.

Sincerely,

Jay S. Hammond
Governor