

SJR

28

STATE OF ALASKA
THE LEGISLATURE

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

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS AGENCY
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE LIBRARY

May, 1988

Copies of minutes listed below were originally included in this file. The minutes are available on the STAIRS database CMPR. In order to save space copies of minutes have not been left in the files.

Mary Van Nimwegen

House C+RA 5-13-87 3:00 p.m.

HOUSE COMMITTEE REPORT

(5)

⑤ SJR 28

Date referred: 5/6/87

FURTHER REFERRALS:

DATE: 05/13/87

The Community and Regional Affairs Committee has considered SJR 28

Relating to housing programs of the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development.

RECOMMENDS:

- replace with _____ the same title
- attached amendment(s) a new title
- do pass
- do not pass
- no recommendation
- individual recommendations
- additional referral to the _____ Committee

ADOPTS: _____ letter of intent

ATTACHES NEW FISCAL NOTE(s):

- fiscal impact same as previous fiscal note published _____
- zero fiscal note same as previous zero fiscal note published _____
- zero with analysis

SIGNING DO PASS:

James Council Zawacki
Virginia Collins Collins
Heinrich Springer Springer

SIGNING OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS:

Springer Heinrich Springer
 Chairman's signature

BILL WORKSHEET

Bill #: SJR 28
Date Sched.: HCRA Committee, Wednesday, May 13, 1987
Title: A Resolution "relating to housing programs of the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development"
Sponsors: Hensley, Binkley, Duncan, Eliason, Kerntulu, Rodey, Zharoff and Szymanski

Info Attached: Copy of Resolution
Fiscal Note
Memorandum from Sponsor

Sponsor's Briefing, Intent/purpose:
To urge the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development not to cut its programs in Alaska.

Effect of Bill:

Fiscal Impact: 0 (Zero)

Analysis of Bill's effect, by staff:

A 1985 BIA study indicated that there still exists a statewide need for 4700 new housing units for Alaska Natives. In 1986 HUD funded 200 units. Agency proposed reductions would cut funding in half for next year. This would probably mean Alaska's allocation would be reduced as well.

Besides the obvious effect on need for housing, the economic effect on an already depressed rural construction industry will further a downward economic spiral.

Alaska's regional housing authorities have already experienced serious diseconomies of scale; any further reduction in activity would make it very difficult to mobilize reduced scale village construction efforts within current cost ceilings.

Committee Report:

Alaska State Senate

④ SJR 28

P.O. Box V
Juneau, AK 99811
Phone: (907) 465-2444
465-3862/465-4923



Senate Finance Committee
State Affairs Committee
Vice-Chair, Rules Committee
Chair, Administrative Regulation Review

William L. Hensley

MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 13, 1987

TO: Senator Arliss Sturgulewski, Chair
Senate Community and Regional Affairs Committee

FROM: Senator Willie Hensley *WH*

SUBJ: SJR 28 - HUD Housing Programs

SJR 28 urges HUD not to cut its programs in Alaska. There are proposals in HUD to cut the total number of units that it funds in half during the next fiscal year. This would probably mean that the units allocated to Alaska would also be reduced by half.

A 1985 study by the BIA indicated that there was a statewide need for 4700 new housing units for Alaska Natives. The only programs that effectively address this need are HUD's rural programs. In 1986, HUD received applications for 642 units, but funded only 200 in Alaska. If the funded units were cut by half, there would be an even higher ratio of unfunded to funded units. This comes at a time when the sluggish economy is decreasing the incomes of residents, which will probably result in a growing need for housing assistance in both urban and rural areas.

An additional problem resulting from any future cuts by HUD is diseconomies of scale. If we continue to distribute HUD funding equitably among the regional housing authorities, each authority will have funding for only a few units. The low number of units in a particular village would make it difficult to find contractors who could provide design and construction services to rural villages within the cost ceilings of the current program. Constructing a larger number of units at one time in a village is much more cost effective. The current funding level represents the threshold necessary to maintain a cost-effective program.

WLH/mjs

