

SB

1411

STATE OF ALASKA
THE LEGISLATURE

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS AGENCY
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE LIBRARY

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

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

SB 141

Senate CERA

3/14/91

STATE OF ALASKA

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

WALTER J. HICKEL, GOVERNOR

P.O. BOX AM
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99811-0100
PHONE: (907)-465-3658
FAX: (907)-465-2090

March 7, 1991

Senator Steve Frank
Chairman, Community and Regional Affairs Committee
Alaska State Legislature
P.O. Box V (MS 3100)
Juneau, Alaska 99811

MAR 08 1991

Dear Senator Frank:

Re: Request for Hearing on Senate Bill 141 and Senate Bill 142
(Capital Project Matching Grant Program)


The Office of the Governor respectfully requests that a hearing be scheduled in the near future before the Senate Community and Regional Affairs Committee on Senate Bill No. 141 and Senate Bill No. 142, regarding Governor Hickel's proposed capital project matching grant program for municipalities and unincorporated communities.

These bills, comprising the enabling legislation for the proposed grant program and the accompanying set of proposed grant appropriations, represent major priorities for Governor Hickel and constitute an integral part of his proposed FY 1991 supplemental capital budget package. In view of this, and in view of the importance of the subject matter, we would greatly appreciate an opportunity for discussion of them as soon as possible within the scheduling constraints of the Committee.

Attached for your reference are copies of SB 141 and SB 142, as well as a sectional analysis of SB 141 and a detailed table showing the development of the appropriation amounts contained in SB 142 (as proposed for amendment in my letter to you of March 4, 1991).

Thank you for your assistance in this matter. Should you have any questions, or need any additional information, please contact me at 465-3568.

Sincerely,



J. Shelby Stastny
Director

Attachments: (4)

Capital Project Matching Grant Program
Enabling Legislation
Office of the Governor

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS

I. SECTION ONE

Section 1 of the bill establishes the capital project matching grant program for municipalities, establishes a fund for the receipt and tracking of grant awards, describes how appropriations to the program will be allocated among grantees, and sets out the formula for determining grantees' local matching shares.

"Municipality" is defined in the bill to include all political subdivisions incorporated under the laws of Alaska that are home rule or general law cities, home rule or general law boroughs, or unified municipalities, per AS 29.71.800(13).

Under the approach taken in the legislation, incorporated boroughs are the instrumentalities for receiving and administering grants for projects affecting unincorporated communities that lie within borough boundaries.

Subsection (a)

This section establishes the grant program for municipalities, as well as a fund for holding and administering grants to municipalities, within the Department of Administration.

The section stipulates that the amount annually appropriated to the municipal fund will be allocated to municipal grantees pro rata on the basis of their population, and credited to individual accounts for them within the fund. Annual grant awards will accumulate, subject to the limitations in subsection (i).

The section also establishes the requirement that each time a grantee wishes to draw funds against its allocation, for a project or projects which it has identified, it must make a matching contribution per the formula set out in subsection (d).

Subsection (b)

This subsection stipulates that all money appropriated to the municipal fund remains in the fund until drawn by grantees, and that the fund's interest earnings are to be credited to the general fund.

Subsection (c)

This subsection essentially stipulates that grantees will be responsible for providing for the maintenance and operating costs of the projects or facilities financed by grants under this program, unless the State already has the responsibility and the cost of such will not rise substantially due to the effects of the grant project. This is the same requirement used in the State's current revenue sharing program.

Subsection (d)

The formula set out in this section calculates the local share, in dollars, required to match each draw that the municipal grantee makes on its grant balance. The general effect of the formula is that the larger a municipal grantee is in terms of its population, and the wealthier it is in terms of its per capita real and personal property valuation, the larger is its required local share for any draw of its grant funds; and vice versa.

The basic relationship reflected in the formula is that for each project, portion of a project, or group of projects - - i.e., for each use to which grant awards are put by a municipality - - the municipality should put up a share, and the State should put up a share. In practice, the State's share would be the amount of any particular draw by a grantee against its outstanding grant balance, and the grantee's share for that draw would be the local share defined in this subsection.

The ratio of the local share to the State share, for any given draw, is defined in this subsection as the grantee's local share factor. That is:

$$\text{Local Share Factor} = \frac{\text{Local Share (as a \%)}}{\text{State Share (as a \%)}}$$

The local share factor multiplied by the dollar amount of the given draw therefore equals the dollar amount due from the grantee as the local share for that draw, as shown below:

$$\text{Since: } \frac{\text{Local Share (in \$)}}{\text{State Share (in \$)}^*} = \frac{\text{Local Share (as a \%)}}{\text{State Share (as a \%)}}$$

$$\text{Then: } \text{Local Share (in \$)} = \frac{\text{Local Share (as a \%)}}{\text{State Share (as a \%)}} \times \text{State Share (in \$)}^*$$

* State Share (in \$) = Draw Amount

Since the State share in dollars is known (the draw amount), and since, the local share and the State share must, when expressed as percentages, add up to 1, the major part of the local share formula is involved with determining the grantee's local share expressed as a percentage of the total proposed outlay - - i.e., with determining the grantee's local share percentage.

Calculation of the local share percentage is straightforward: it equals the product of the municipal grantee's population factor and its local wealth factor. Population factors for municipalities are designated in this subsection, according to municipal population sizes. The local wealth factor for a grantee is simply the grantee's per capita real and personal property valuation divided by the statewide average for all municipalities - - i.e., the grantee's per capita wealth relative to that of other municipalities, where the statewide average local wealth factor is 1.0.

The constraints on the local share factor contained in (d)(1)(B) and (d)(1)(C) ensure that the effective local share percentage for any grantee will not exceed 50 percent or be lower than 10 percent, per the limitations provided under subsection (f).

Subsection (d) also stipulates that if the grantee is an organized borough, the population and valuation data used in its local share formula calculation are to be net of the population and valuation components attributable to any incorporated municipality located within the borough. This reflects the approach taken in the design of this program that incorporated boroughs would be the instrumentalities responsible for receiving and administering grants for projects affecting unincorporated communities which are located within organized boroughs.

Subsection (e)

This subsection effectively stipulates that the minimum grant to a municipality under this program will be \$25 thousand per year, subject to the actual level of appropriation for the municipal program.

Subsection (f)

This subsection effectively limits the amount of the local share, by stipulating that the grantee's local share percentage as defined under subsection (d) can not exceed 50 percent, and can not be less than 10 percent.

Subsection (g)

This subsection stipulates that a grantee can use almost any source of money for its local share (with precise in-kind contributions effectively to be defined in regulations), except money from State sources.

Subsection (h)

This subsection stipulates that the population data and local valuation data used for municipal grantees shall be the same as that compiled and developed by the Department of Community and Regional Affairs for the State revenue sharing program.

Subsection (i)

This subsection stipulates that if a grantee makes no draws against a particular annual grant appropriation or allocation for five years, the money lapses into the general fund. It also stipulates that, once a draw has been made, progress on the project or projects for which the draw was made must be begun within five years of the draw, or else the drawn money must be returned to the grantee's account in the municipal grant fund, where it will remain available for later use by the grantee.

Subsection (j)

This subsection requires grantees and their contractors to adhere to the established hiring preferences and requirements for economically distressed or disadvantaged individuals, zones and geographic areas set out by the Department of Labor under AS 36.10.

Subsection (k)

This subsection contains several definitions essential for interpreting the provisions of Section 1 of the bill.

SECTION TWO

This section of the bill effectively repeals the existing prohibition against the promulgation of regulations and guidelines for existing grant programs for municipalities, unincorporated communities and named recipients, and explicitly allows the promulgation of regulations and guidelines for those programs as well as for the municipal grant program established under this bill.

SECTION THREE

Section 3 of the bill establishes the capital project matching grant program for unincorporated communities, establishes a fund for the receipt and tracking of grant awards, describes how appropriations to the program will be allocated among grantees, and sets out a fixed percentage for determining grantees' local matching shares.

"Unincorporated Community" is defined in the bill as any place in the unorganized borough that is not incorporated as a city and in which 25 or more persons reside as a social unit, per AS 29.60.140(b). This is the definition used in the Department of Community and Regional Affairs' state revenue sharing program.

Subsection (a)

This section establishes the grant program for unincorporated communities located in the unorganized borough, as well as a fund for holding and administering grants to those communities, within the Department of Community and Regional Affairs.

The section stipulates that the amount annually appropriated to the unincorporated community fund will be allocated to grantees pro rata on the basis of the number of unincorporated communities participating in the program, and credited to individual accounts for them within the fund. Annual grant awards will accumulate, subject to the limitations in subsections (d) and (h).

The section also establishes the requirement that each time a grantee wishes to draw funds against its allocation, for a project or projects which it has identified, it must make a matching contribution per the stipulation set out in subsection (f).

Subsection (b)

This subsection stipulates that all money appropriated to the unincorporated community fund remains in the fund until drawn by grantees, and that the fund's interest earnings are to be credited to the general fund.

Subsection (c)

This subsection essentially stipulates that grantees will be responsible for providing for the maintenance and operating costs of the projects or facilities financed by grants under this program, unless the State already has the responsibility and the cost of such will not rise substantially due to the effects of the grant project. This is the same requirement used in the State's current revenue sharing program.

Subsection (d)

This subsection essentially sets out the procedures which the Department of Community and Regional Affairs must use in identifying potential grant recipients for unincorporated communities. The procedures and limitations entailed are those currently required in the State revenue sharing program.

Subsection (e)

This subsection effectively stipulates that the minimum grant to an unincorporated community under this program will be \$15 thousand per year, subject to the actual level of appropriation for the municipal program.

Subsection (f)

This subsection stipulates that the required local share for unincorporated communities under this program is 10 percent of the sum of the local share and the draw taken.

Subsection (g)

This subsection stipulates that a grantee can use almost any source of money for its local share (with precise in-kind contributions effectively to be defined in regulations), except money from State sources.

Subsection (h)

This subsection stipulates that if a grantee makes no draws against a particular annual grant appropriation or allocation for five years, the money lapses into the general fund. It also stipulates that, once a draw has been made, progress on the project or projects for which the draw was made must be begun within five years of the draw, or else the drawn money must be returned to the grantee's account in the unincorporated community grant fund, where it will remain available for later use by the grantee.

Subsection (i)

This subsection requires grantees and their contractors to adhere to the established hiring preferences and requirements for economically distressed or disadvantaged individuals, zones and geographic areas set out by the Department of Labor under AS 36.10.

Subsection (j)

This subsection allows the promulgation of regulations and guidelines for unincorporated community matching grant program established under this bill.

Subsection (k)

This subsection stipulates that the program cost ceiling set in AS 44.47.140 does not apply to the unincorporated community matching grant program established under this bill.

Subsection (l)

This subsection contains several definitions essential for interpreting the provisions of Section 1 of the bill.

SECTION FOUR

This section of the bill sets the effective date for the capital projects matching grant program as the start of FY 1992.

FY 1991 SUPPLEMENTAL CAPITAL BUDGET

COMMUNITY MATCHING GRANT ALLOCATIONS

A. MUNICIPALITIES

The sum of \$58,830,000 is allocated below for FY 1991 supplemental capital projects and capital improvements for municipalities pursuant to AS 37.05.319 (proposed), to be allocated as follows:

	<u>State Share</u>	<u>Local Share</u>	<u>Local Match %</u>
Akhiok	\$ 25,000	\$ 2,778	10.00%
Akiak	28,776	3,197	10.00%
Akutan	47,996	5,333	10.00%
Alakanuk	62,773	6,975	10.00%
Aleknagik	25,000	2,778	10.00%
Aleutians East Borough	25,000	2,778	10.00%
Allakaket	25,000	2,778	10.00%
Ambler	34,331	3,815	10.00%
Anaktuvuk Pass	28,220	3,136	10.00%
Anchorage, Municipality of	24,770,319	24,770,319	50.00%
Anderson	70,550	7,839	10.00%
Angoon	76,105	8,456	10.00%
Aniak	61,995	6,888	10.00%
Anvik	25,000	2,778	10.00%
Atka	25,000	2,778	10.00%
Atkasuk	24,998	2,778	10.00%
Barrow	375,416	41,713	10.00%
Bethel	487,740	103,659	17.50%
Bettles	25,000	2,778	10.00%
Brevig Mission	25,000	2,778	10.00%
Bristol Bay Borough	161,210	84,416	34.40%
Buckland	33,553	3,728	10.00%
Chefomak	33,220	3,691	10.00%
Chevak	65,995	7,333	10.00%
Chignik	25,000	2,778	10.00%
Chuathbaluk	25,000	2,778	10.00%
Clark's point	25,000	2,778	10.00%
Coffman cove	25,000	2,778	10.00%
Cold bay	25,000	2,778	10.00%
Cordova	290,978	72,094	19.90%
Craig	136,767	21,897	13.80%
Deering	25,000	2,778	10.00%

	<u>State Share</u>	<u>Local Share</u>	<u>Local Match %</u>
Delta Junction	131,657	14,629	10.00%
Dillingham	247,981	71,861	22.50%
Diomedea	25,000	2,778	10.00%
Eagle	25,000	2,778	10.00%
Eek	30,938	3,444	10.00%
Ekwok	25,000	2,778	10.00%
Elim	32,664	3,029	10.00%
Emmonak	74,994	8,333	10.00%
Fairbanks	3,138,759	3,138,759	50.00%
Fairbanks North Star Borough	4,721,859	4,721,859	50.00%
Fort Yukon	71,328	7,925	10.00%
Galena	103,103	11,456	10.00%
Gambell	57,773	6,419	10.00%
Golovin	25,000	2,778	10.00%
Goodnews Bay	25,554	2,839	10.00%
Grayling	25,331	2,815	10.00%
Haines	128,879	29,430	18.60%
Haines Borough	187,208	28,646	13.30%
Holy Cross	30,664	3,407	10.00%
Homer	481,963	120,911	20.10%
Hoonah	99,326	11,036	10.00%
Hooper Bay	89,660	9,962	10.00%
Houston	81,994	9,110	10.00%
Hughes	25,000	2,778	10.00%
Huslia	24,998	2,778	10.00%
Hydaburg	50,774	5,642	10.00%
Juneau, City and Borough of	3,327,078	3,327,078	50.00%
Kachemak	46,441	5,160	10.00%
Kake	75,328	8,370	10.00%
Kaktovik	24,887	2,765	10.00%
Kaltag	29,775	3,308	10.00%
Kasaan	25,000	2,778	10.00%
Kenai	726,944	535,575	42.40%
Kenai Peninsula Borough	2,431,591	2,431,591	50.00%
Ketchikan	858,823	858,823	50.00%
Ketchikan Gateway Borough	510,183	260,809	33.80%
Kiana	45,996	5,111	10.00%
King Cove	87,771	9,752	10.00%
Kivalina	33,109	3,679	10.00%
Klawock	99,659	11,073	10.00%
Kobuk	25,000	2,778	10.00%
Kodiak	752,609	752,609	50.00%
Kodiak Island Borough	857,267	265,953	23.70%
Kotlik	50,218	5,580	10.00%
Kotzebue	411,635	54,969	11.80%
Koyuk	24,887	2,765	10.00%
Koyukuk	25,000	2,778	10.00%
Kupreanof	25,000	2,778	10.00%
Kwethluk	60,106	6,678	10.00%
Lake and Peninsula Borough	133,101	22,893	14.70%
Larsen Bay	25,000	2,778	10.00%
Lower Kalskag	30,331	3,370	10.00%

	<u>Slate Share</u>	<u>Local Share</u>	<u>Local Match %</u>
Manokotak	41,108	4,568	10.00%
Marshall	32,664	3,629	10.00%
Matanuska-Susitna Borough	3,434,958	3,434,958	50.00%
McGrath	59,218	6,580	10.00%
Mekoryuk	25,000	2,778	10.00%
Mountain Village	82,438	9,160	10.00%
Napakiak	34,997	3,889	10.00%
Napaskiak	36,775	4,086	10.00%
Nenana	61,662	6,851	10.00%
New Stuyahok	41,552	4,617	10.00%
Newhalen	25,000	2,778	10.00%
Nikolai	25,000	2,778	10.00%
Nome	478,074	74,993	13.60%
Nondalton	25,442	2,827	10.00%
Noorvik	66,662	7,407	10.00%
North Pole	178,875	168,296	48.50%
North Slope Borough	253,869	253,869	50.00%
Northwest Arctic Borough	34,997	3,889	10.00%
Nuiqsut	35,997	4,000	10.00%
Nulato	40,219	4,469	10.00%
Nunapitchuk	41,330	4,592	10.00%
Old Harbor	35,775	3,975	10.00%
Ouzinkie	25,000	2,778	10.00%
Palmer	331,974	57,412	14.70%
Pelican	27,887	3,099	10.00%
Petersburg	382,193	95,349	20.00%
Pilot Station	50,552	5,617	10.00%
Point Hope	67,773	7,530	10.00%
Port Alexander	25,000	2,778	10.00%
Port Heiden	25,000	2,778	10.00%
Port Lions	33,331	3,703	10.00%
Quinhagak	55,440	6,160	10.00%
Ruby	26,998	3,000	10.00%
Russian Mission	29,553	3,284	10.00%
Sand Point	110,325	12,258	10.00%
Savoonga	56,773	6,308	10.00%
Saxman	34,220	3,802	10.00%
Scammon Bay	33,997	3,777	10.00%
Selawik	74,661	8,296	10.00%
Seldovia	62,773	6,975	10.00%
Seward	314,309	82,892	20.90%
Shageluk	25,000	2,778	10.00%
Shaktolik	25,000	2,778	10.00%
Sheldon Point	25,000	2,778	10.00%
Shishmaref	47,774	5,308	10.00%
Shungnak	25,000	2,778	10.00%
Sitka, City and Borough of	917,374	917,374	50.00%
Skagway	78,216	9,562	10.90%
Soldotna	414,746	121,832	22.70%
St. George	25,000	2,778	10.00%
St. Mary's	54,551	6,061	10.00%
St. Michael	33,664	3,740	10.00%

	<u>State Share</u>	<u>Local Share</u>	<u>Local Match %</u>
St. Paul	65,106	7,234	10.00%
Stebbins	43,774	4,864	10.00%
Tanana	45,996	5,111	10.00%
Teller	26,331	2,926	10.00%
Tenakee Springs	25,000	2,778	10.00%
Thorne Bay	58,329	6,481	10.00%
Togiak	79,216	8,802	10.00%
Toksook Bay	49,552	5,506	10.00%
Tuluksak	39,664	4,407	10.00%
Unalakleet	82,216	9,135	10.00%
Unalaska	251,647	69,652	21.70%
Upper Kalskag	25,000	2,778	10.00%
Valdez	799,161	799,161	50.00%
Wainwright	56,885	6,321	10.00%
Wales	25,000	2,778	10.00%
Wasilla	371,305	150,888	28.90%
White Mountain	25,000	2,778	10.00%
Whittier	33,220	3,691	10.00%
Wrangell	292,200	62,914	17.70%
Yakutat	58,551	6,506	10.00%
TOTAL:	\$58,830,000	\$48,591,990	45.2%

B. UNINCORPORATED COMMUNITIES IN UNORGANIZED BOROUGH

The sum of \$1,170,000 is allocated below for FY 1991 supplemental capital projects and capital improvements for municipalities pursuant to AS 44.47.195 (proposed), to be allocated as follows:

[Each community shown in 2/29/91 appropriation bill is allocated \$15 thousand.]

CAPITAL PROJECT MATCHING GRANT PROGRAM

2/25/91

Local Share % = Col. C x Col. F

Total State Funds (\$000): 58,833.0
 Minimum State Share (\$000): 25.0
 Maximum Local Share (%): 50%
 Minimum Local Share (%): 10%

Population Factors:	Under 1,000	1,000-4,999	5,000-10,000	Over 10,000
	0.1	0.3	0.7	1.0

(A) Community	(B) Population	(C) Population Factor	(D) DCRA Assessed Full Value (\$)	(E) Per Capita Value (\$)	(F) Local Wealth Factor	(G) LOCAL SHARE %	(H) \$000	(I) STATE SHARE %	(J) \$000	(K) Leverage Ratio
Akhiok	83	.1	1,758,000	18,903	0.266	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Akiak	259	.1	8,454,191	32,642	0.460	10.0%	3.2	90.0%	28.8	1.11
Akulun	432	.1	10,816,600	25,038	0.353	10.0%	5.3	90.0%	48.0	1.11
Alakanuk	565	.1	18,442,540	32,642	0.460	10.0%	7.0	90.0%	62.8	1.11
Aleknagik	159	.1	5,190,025	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Aleutians East Borough	138	.1	0	0	0.000	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Alakaket	202	.1	6,593,616	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Ambler	309	.1	3,469,100	11,227	0.158	10.0%	3.8	90.0%	34.3	1.11
Anaktuvuk Pass	254	.1	1,588,000	6,252	0.088	10.0%	3.1	90.0%	28.2	1.11
Anchorage, Municipality of	222,950	1.0	9,836,722,410	44,121	0.622	50.0%	24,770.3	50.0%	24,770.3	2.00
Anderson	635	.1	20,727,457	32,642	0.460	10.0%	7.8	90.0%	70.6	1.11
Angoon	685	.1	22,359,540	32,642	0.460	10.0%	8.5	90.0%	76.1	1.11
Aniak	558	.1	18,214,049	32,642	0.460	10.0%	6.9	90.0%	62.0	1.11
Anvik	89	.1	2,905,108	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Atka	90	.1	2,937,750	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Atkasuk	225	.1	1,925,000	8,556	0.121	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Barrow	3,379	.3	49,341,100	14,602	0.206	10.0%	41.7	90.0%	375.4	1.11
Bethel	4,390	.3	181,980,500	41,453	0.584	17.5%	103.7	82.5%	487.7	1.21
Bettles	45	.1	1,468,875	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Brevig Mission	197	.1	6,430,408	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Bristol Bay Borough	1,451	.3	117,937,900	81,280	1.146	34.4%	84.4	65.6%	161.2	1.52
Buckland	302	.1	3,145,300	10,415	0.147	10.0%	3.7	90.0%	33.6	1.11
Chefornak	299	.1	9,759,858	32,642	0.460	10.0%	3.7	90.0%	33.2	1.11
Chevak	594	.1	19,389,149	32,642	0.460	10.0%	7.3	90.0%	66.0	1.11
Chignik	128	.1	8,709,200	68,041	0.959	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Chuathbakuk	127	.1	4,145,491	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Clark's point	87	.1	2,839,825	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Coffman cove	195	.1	6,365,125	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Cold bay	158	.1	8,482,400	53,686	0.757	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Cordova	2,619	.3	122,992,900	46,962	0.662	19.9%	72.1	80.1%	291.0	1.25
Craig	1,231	.3	40,178,500	32,639	0.460	13.8%	21.9	86.2%	136.8	1.16
Doering	165	.1	1,867,700	11,319	0.160	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Delta Junction	1,185	.3	27,731,800	23,402	0.330	10.0%	14.6	90.0%	131.7	1.11

CAPITAL PROJECT MATCHING GRANT PROGRAM

2/25/91

Local Share % = Col. C x Col. F

Total State Funds (\$000): 58,830.0
 Minimum State Share (\$000): 25.0
 Maximum Local Share (%): 50%
 Minimum Local Share (%): 10%

Population Factor	Under 1,000	1,000-4,999	5,000-10,000	Over 10,000
	0.1	0.3	0.7	1.0

(A) Community	(B) Population	(C) Population Factor	(D) DCA Assessed Fril Value (\$)	(E) Per Capita Value (\$)	(F) Local Wealth Factor	(G) LOCAL SHARE %	(H) \$000	(I) STATE SHARE %	(J) \$000	(K) Leverage Ratio
Dillingham	2,232	.3	118,601,000	53,137	0.749	22.5%	71.9	77.5%	248.0	1.29
Dionode	184	.1	6,006,066	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Eagle	174	.1	8,388,300	48,209	0.670	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Eek	279	.1	9,107,024	32,642	0.460	10.0%	3.4	90.0%	31.0	1.11
Ekwok	122	.1	3,982,283	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Elim	294	.1	9,596,649	32,642	0.460	10.0%	3.6	90.0%	32.7	1.11
Emmonak	675	.1	22,033,123	32,642	0.460	10.0%	8.3	90.0%	75.0	1.11
Fairbanks	28,251	1.0	1,071,624,900	37,932	0.535	50.0%	3,138.8	50.0%	3,138.8	2.00
Fairbanks North Star Borough	42,500	1.0	2,142,124,000	50,403	0.710	50.0%	4,721.9	50.0%	4,721.9	2.00
Fort Yukon	642	.1	20,955,948	32,642	0.460	10.0%	7.9	90.0%	71.3	1.11
Galena	928	.1	19,585,100	21,105	0.297	10.0%	11.5	90.0%	103.1	1.11
Gambell	520	.1	16,973,665	32,642	0.460	10.0%	6.4	90.0%	57.8	1.11
Golovin	154	.1	5,026,816	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Goodnews Bay	230	.1	7,507,583	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.6	1.11
Grayling	228	.1	7,442,299	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.3	1.11
Haines	1,160	.3	51,001,500	43,967	0.620	18.6%	29.4	81.4%	128.9	1.23
Haines Borough	1,685	.3	52,886,700	31,387	0.442	13.3%	28.6	86.7%	187.2	1.15
Holy Cross	276	.1	9,009,099	32,642	0.460	10.0%	3.4	90.0%	30.7	1.11
Homer	4,338	.3	205,761,300	47,432	0.669	20.1%	120.9	79.9%	482.0	1.25
Hoonah	894	.1	21,596,000	24,145	0.340	10.0%	11.0	90.0%	99.3	1.11
Hooper Bay	807	.1	5,203,800	6,448	0.091	10.0%	10.0	90.0%	89.7	1.11
Houston	738	.1	33,028,500	44,754	0.631	10.0%	9.1	90.0%	82.0	1.11
Hughes	75	.1	2,448,125	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Huslia	225	.1	7,344,374	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Hydaburg	457	.1	9,024,100	19,746	0.278	10.0%	5.6	90.0%	50.8	1.11
Juneau, City and Borough of	29,946	1.0	1,247,450,700	41,657	0.587	50.0%	3,327.1	50.0%	3,327.1	2.00
Kachemak	418	.1	17,954,400	42,953	0.605	10.0%	5.2	90.0%	46.4	1.11
Kake	678	.1	16,843,800	24,843	0.350	10.0%	8.4	90.0%	75.3	1.11
Kaktovik	224	.1	2,219,300	9,908	0.140	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	24.9	1.11
Kaltag	268	.1	8,749,966	32,642	0.460	10.0%	3.3	90.0%	29.8	1.11
Kasaan	69	.1	2,252,275	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Kenai	6,543	.7	281,331,400	42,997	0.606	42.4%	535.6	57.6%	726.9	1.74
Kenai Peninsula Borough	21,886	1.0	2,419,659,910	110,557	1.558	50.0%	2,431.6	50.0%	2,431.6	2.00

CAPITAL PROJECT MATCHING GRANT PROGRAM

2/25/11

Local Share % = Col. C x Col. F

Total State Funds (\$000): 58,830.0
 Minimum State Share (\$000): 25.0
 Maximum Local Share (%): 50%
 Minimum Local Share (%): 10%

Population Factors:	Under 1,000	1,000-4,999	5,000-10,000	Over 10,000
	0.1	0.3	0.7	1.0

(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)
Community	Population	Population Factor	DCRA Assessed Full Value (\$)	Per Capita Value (\$)	Local Wealth Factor	LOCAL SHARE %	\$000	STATE SHARE %	\$000	Leverage Ratio
Ketchikan	7,730	.7	438,590,300	56,730	0.800	50.0%	858.8	50.0%	858.8	2.00
Ketchikan Gateway Borough	4,592	.3	367,375,500	80,003	1.128	33.8%	260.8	66.2%	510.2	1.51
Kiana	414	.1	5,051,900	12,203	0.172	10.0%	5.1	90.0%	46.0	1.11
King Cove	790	.1	29,189,300	36,949	0.521	10.0%	9.8	90.0%	87.8	1.11
Kivalina	298	.1	3,308,600	11,371	0.160	10.0%	3.7	90.0%	33.1	1.11
Klawock	897	.1	9,194,000	10,250	0.144	10.0%	11.1	90.0%	99.7	1.11
Kobuk	87	.1	1,102,900	12,677	0.179	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Kodiak	6,774	.7	438,936,900	64,797	0.913	50.0%	752.6	50.0%	752.6	2.00
Kodiak Island Borough	7,716	.7	185,178,500	23,999	0.338	23.7%	266.0	76.3%	857.3	1.31
Kotik	452	.1	14,754,032	32,642	0.460	10.0%	5.6	90.0%	50.2	1.11
Kotzebue	3,705	.3	103,226,300	27,851	0.393	11.8%	55.0	88.2%	411.6	1.13
Koyuk	224	.1	7,311,733	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	24.9	1.11
Koyukuk	138	.1	4,504,550	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Kupreanof	52	.1	1,697,367	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Kwethluk	541	.1	17,659,140	32,642	0.460	10.0%	6.7	90.0%	60.1	1.11
Lake and Peninsula Borough	1,198	.3	41,579,700	34,708	0.489	14.7%	22.9	85.3%	133.1	1.17
Larsen Bay	149	.1	3,268,300	21,935	0.309	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Lower Kalskag	273	.1	8,911,174	32,642	0.460	10.0%	3.4	90.0%	30.3	1.11
Manokotak	370	.1	12,077,416	32,642	0.460	10.0%	4.6	90.0%	41.1	1.11
Marshall	294	.1	9,596,649	32,642	0.460	10.0%	3.6	90.0%	32.7	1.11
Matanuska-Susitna Borough	30,917	1.0	1,417,950,990	45,833	0.660	50.0%	3,435.0	50.0%	3,435.0	2.00
McGrath	533	.1	17,398,007	32,642	0.460	10.0%	6.6	90.0%	59.2	1.11
Mekoryuk	190	.1	6,201,916	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Mountain Village	742	.1	24,220,115	32,642	0.460	10.0%	9.2	90.0%	82.4	1.11
Napaklak	315	.1	10,282,124	32,642	0.460	10.0%	3.9	90.0%	35.0	1.11
Napaskiak	331	.1	10,804,391	32,642	0.460	10.0%	4.1	90.0%	36.8	1.11
Nenana	555	.1	16,186,800	29,165	0.411	10.0%	6.9	90.0%	61.7	1.11
New Stuyahok	374	.1	12,207,982	32,642	0.460	10.0%	4.6	90.0%	41.6	1.11
Newhalen	168	.1	3,602,800	21,445	0.302	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Nikolai	113	.1	3,688,508	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Nome	4,303	.3	137,990,000	32,068	0.452	13.5%	75.0	86.4%	478.1	1.16
Nondalton	229	.1	3,804,400	16,613	0.234	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.4	1.11
Noorvik	600	.1	6,457,500	10,763	0.152	10.0%	7.4	90.0%	66.7	1.11

CAPITAL PROJECT MATCHING GRANT PROGRAM

2/25/91

Local Share % = Col. C x Col. F

Total State Funds (\$000): 58,830.0
 Minimum State Share (\$000): 25.0
 Maximum Local Share (%): 50%
 Minimum Local Share (%): 10%

Population	Under	1,000-	5,000-	Over
Factors:	1,000	4,999	10,000	10,000
	0.1	0.3	0.7	1.0

(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)
Community	Population	Population Factor	DCRA Assessed Full Value (\$)	Per Capita Value (\$)	Local Wealth Factor	LOCAL SHARE %	STATE SHARE \$000	STATE SHARE %	STATE SHARE \$000	Leverage Ratio
North Pole	1,610	.3	184,583,000	114,648	1.616	48.5%	168.3	51.5%	178.9	1.94
North Slope Borough	2,285	.3	11,883,976,500	5,200,865	73.302	50.0%	253.9	50.0%	253.9	2.00
Northwest Arctic Borough	315	.1	4,110,500	13,049	0.184	10.0%	3.9	90.0%	35.0	1.11
Nulqsut	324	.1	11,996,900	37,027	0.522	10.0%	4.0	90.0%	36.0	1.11
Nulato	362	.1	11,816,282	32,642	0.460	10.0%	4.5	90.0%	40.2	1.11
Nunapitchuk	372	.1	12,142,699	32,642	0.460	10.0%	4.6	90.0%	41.3	1.11
Old Harbor	322	.1	5,797,400	17,973	0.253	10.0%	4.0	90.0%	35.8	1.11
Ouzinkie	214	.1	3,245,100	15,907	0.224	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Palmar	2,998	.3	104,192,300	34,870	0.491	14.7%	57.4	25.3%	332.0	1.17
Pelican	251	.1	10,440,800	41,597	0.586	10.0%	3.1	90.0%	27.9	1.11
Petersburg	3,440	.3	162,441,900	47,221	0.666	20.0%	85.3	80.0%	382.2	1.25
Pilot Station	455	.1	14,851,957	32,642	0.460	10.0%	5.6	90.0%	50.6	1.11
Point Hope	610	.1	7,034,600	11,532	0.163	10.0%	7.5	90.0%	67.8	1.11
Port Alexander	119	.1	3,884,358	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Port Heiden	121	.1	2,675,400	22,111	0.312	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Port Lions	300	.1	6,869,600	23,232	0.327	10.0%	3.7	90.0%	33.3	1.11
Quinhagak	499	.1	16,288,190	32,642	0.460	10.0%	6.2	90.0%	55.4	1.11
Ruby	243	.1	7,931,924	32,642	0.460	10.0%	3.0	90.0%	27.0	1.11
Russian Mission	266	.1	8,682,683	32,642	0.460	10.0%	3.3	90.0%	29.6	1.11
Sand Point	983	.1	39,039,700	39,315	0.554	10.0%	12.3	90.0%	110.3	1.11
Savoonga	511	.1	16,679,890	32,642	0.460	10.0%	6.3	90.0%	56.8	1.11
Saxman	308	.1	13,305,600	43,200	0.609	10.0%	3.8	90.0%	34.2	1.11
Scammon Bay	306	.1	9,988,349	32,642	0.460	10.0%	3.8	90.0%	34.0	1.11
Selawik	672	.1	7,930,700	11,802	0.166	10.0%	8.3	90.0%	74.7	1.11
Seldovia	565	.1	21,089,400	37,326	0.526	10.0%	7.0	90.0%	62.8	1.11
Seward	2,829	.3	139,627,200	49,356	0.696	20.9%	82.9	79.1%	314.3	1.26
Shageluk	152	.1	4,961,533	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Shaktolik	197	.1	5,430,409	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Sheldon Point	131	.1	4,276,058	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Shishmaref	430	.1	14,035,916	32,642	0.460	10.0%	5.3	90.0%	47.8	1.11
Shungnak	214	.1	2,963,300	13,847	0.195	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Sitka, City and Borough of	8,257	.7	446,049,500	54,118	0.763	50.0%	917.4	50.0%	917.4	2.00
Skagway	704	.1	54,411,100	77,288	1.089	10.9%	9.6	89.1%	78.2	1.12

CAPITAL PROJECT MATCHING GRANT PROGRAM

2/25/91

Local Share % = Col. C x Col. F

Total State Funds (\$000): 58,830.0
 Minimum State Share (%000): 25.0
 Maximum Local Share (%): 50%
 Minimum Local Share (%): 10%

Population Factors:	Under 1,000	1,000-4,999	5,000-10,000	Over 10,000
	0.1	0.3	0.7	1.0

(A) Community	(B) Population	(C) Population Factor	(D) DCRA Assessed Full Value (\$)	(E) Per Capita Value (\$)	(F) Local Wealth Factor	(G) LOCAL SHARE %	(H) \$000	(I) STATE SHARE %	(J) \$000	(K) Leverage Ratio
Soldotna	3,733	.3	200,457,150	53,699	0.757	22.7%	121.8	77.3%	414.7	1.29
St. George	188	.1	6,136,633	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
St. Mary's	491	.1	4,184,700	8,523	0.120	10.0%	6.1	90.0%	54.6	1.11
St. Michael	303	.1	9,890,424	32,642	0.460	10.0%	3.7	90.0%	33.7	1.11
St. Paul	585	.1	19,128,015	32,642	0.460	10.0%	7.2	90.0%	65.1	1.11
Stebbins	394	.1	12,860,816	32,642	0.460	10.0%	4.9	90.0%	43.8	1.11
Tanana	414	.1	11,511,900	27,807	0.392	10.0%	5.1	90.0%	46.0	1.11
Teller	237	.1	7,736,074	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.9	90.0%	26.3	1.11
Tenakee Springs	108	.1	3,525,390	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Thorne Bay	525	.1	17,136,874	32,642	0.460	10.0%	6.5	90.0%	58.3	1.11
Togiak	713	.1	23,273,507	32,642	0.460	10.0%	8.8	90.0%	79.2	1.11
Toksook Bay	446	.1	14,558,182	32,642	0.460	10.0%	5.5	90.0%	49.6	1.11
Tulksak	357	.1	11,653,074	32,642	0.460	10.0%	4.4	90.0%	39.7	1.11
Unalakleet	740	.1	24,154,832	32,642	0.460	10.0%	9.1	90.0%	82.2	1.11
Unalaska	2,265	.3	116,125,240	51,269	0.723	21.7%	69.7	78.3%	251.6	1.28
Upper Kalskag	149	.1	4,863,608	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Valdez	7,193	.7	1,370,370,900	190,515	2.685	50.0%	799.2	50.0%	799.2	2.00
Wainwright	512	.1	3,692,900	7,213	0.102	10.0%	6.3	90.0%	56.9	1.11
Wales	161	.1	5,255,308	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Wasilla	3,342	.3	228,384,700	68,338	0.963	28.9%	150.9	71.1%	371.3	1.41
White Mountain	180	.1	5,875,500	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Whitler	299	.1	18,415,600	61,591	0.868	10.0%	3.7	90.0%	33.2	1.11
Wrangell	2,630	.3	110,198,000	41,900	0.591	17.7%	62.9	82.3%	292.2	1.22
Yakutat	527	.1	19,792,100	37,556	0.529	10.0%	6.5	90.0%	58.6	1.11
TOTAL:	156	528,207.	\$37,334,789,850			45%	48,592.0	55%	58,830.0	1.83

STATEWIDE AVERAGE:

\$70,951 1.000

SENATE BILL NO. 141

IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

SEVENTEENTH LEGISLATURE - FIRST SESSION

BY THE SENATE RULES COMMITTEE BY REQUEST OF THE GOVERNOR

Introduced: 2/25/91
Referred: CRA and Finance

A BILL**FOR AN ACT ENTITLED**

1 "An Act establishing a capital project matching grant program for municipalities and
2 unincorporated communities; authorizing the adoption of regulations; and providing for an
3 effective date."

4 **BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:**

5 * **Section 1.** AS 37.05 is amended by adding a new section to read:

6 Sec. 37.05.322. MUNICIPAL CAPITAL PROJECT MATCHING GRANT PROGRAM
7 AND FUND. (a) The municipal capital project matching grant program and fund are established
8 within the Department of Administration. Subject to annual appropriations to the fund, each
9 municipality is eligible to receive a grant under this section. Amounts for each municipality shall
10 be allocated to individual accounts within the fund. The amount of each municipality's grant is
11 determined by multiplying the annual appropriation for the program by a fraction, the numerator
12 of which is the population of the municipality and the denominator of which is the population
13 of all municipalities eligible for a grant under this section. A municipality receiving a grant
14 under this section may draw amounts from its account for purposes of planning, design, and

1 construction of capital projects or capital improvements, as defined in AS 37.07.120, that will
2 be used for a public purpose. For each draw, the grantee must make a contribution, as
3 determined under (d) of this section, to pay for the local share of the project or improvement
4 financed by the draw.

5 (b) Except as provided in (i) of this section, money appropriated to the fund established
6 in (a) of this section remains in the fund until drawn against by a grantee. Interest earned on
7 grant money in the fund accrues to the general fund.

8 (c) In accepting a grant under (a) of this section, a grantee covenants with the state that
9 it will operate and maintain the capital projects and capital improvements for which the grant is
10 used for the practical life of those projects or improvements, and that the grantee will not rely
11 on the state to operate or maintain those projects or improvements or pay for operation or
12 maintenance. This requirement does not apply to use of the grant money for repair or
13 improvement of an existing facility that is operated or maintained by the state at the time that
14 a draw against the grant for that purpose is taken, if the repair or improvement for which the
15 grant is used will not substantially increase the operating or maintenance costs to the state.

16 (d) Except as provided in (f) of this section, for each draw against a grant awarded under
17 (a) of this section, the amount of the local share equals the local share factor multiplied by the
18 draw, where

19 (1) the local share factor

20 (A) equals the local share percentage divided by the state share percentage;

21 (B) equals 1.0 if the population factor is 1.0 and the local wealth factor
22 is greater than 1.0; or

23 (C) equals 0.11 if the local wealth factor is 0;

24 (2) the local share percentage equals the grantee's population factor multiplied
25 by its local wealth factor; for purposes of this paragraph,

26 (A) the population factor of the grantee is 0.1 if its population is less than
27 1,000 persons, 0.3 if its population is between 1,000 and 4,999 persons, 0.7 if its
28 population is between 5,000 and 10,000 persons, and 1.0 if its population is more than
29 10,000 persons;

30 (B) the local wealth factor of the grantee is the number obtained by
31 dividing its per capita taxable real and personal property valuation by the statewide

1 average per capita taxable real and personal property valuation for municipalities in the
2 state; and

3 (C) if the grantee is an organized borough, both the population data and
4 the taxable real and personal property valuation used for the calculations in (A) and (B)
5 of this paragraph do not include the components of them that are attributable to
6 incorporated communities located within the borough;

7 (3) the state share percentage equals one minus the local share percentage.

8 (e) A grant awarded under (a) of this section may not be less than \$25,000.

9 (f) The amount of the local share calculated under (d) of this section must be adjusted,
10 if necessary, so that it

11 (1) does not exceed 50 percent of the cost of the planning, design, and
12 construction for which the draw is taken under (a) of this section; or

13 (2) is not less than 10 percent of the cost of the planning, design, and construction
14 for which the draw is taken under (a) of this section.

15 (g) For purposes of (a) in this section, the local share may be satisfied from federal or
16 municipal money, locally contributed manpower, materials, or equipment the value of which has
17 been established by the Department of Administration, or money from any other non-state source.
18 The local share may not be satisfied from money derived from appropriations, allocations,
19 entitlements, grants, or payments from the state.

20 (h) The population data and the community full and true assessed valuation data used by
21 the Department of Community and Regional Affairs to establish state revenue-sharing allocations
22 under AS 14.70.140, AS 29.45.110 and AS 29.60.140 - 29.60.150 shall be used to determine the
23 amount of the grant awards made under (a) of this section and the local share under (d) of this
24 section.

25 (i) A municipality shall repay grant money drawn from a grant awarded under (a) of this
26 section for use on a capital project or improvement to the account established under (a) of this
27 section if substantial, ongoing work on the project or improvement is not started within five years
28 after the effective date of the appropriation of the grant. An appropriation or allocation for a
29 grant lapses to the general fund if no draw is taken against a grant awarded under (a) of this
30 section for a period of five years.

31 (j) A municipality awarded a grant under (a) of this section, or agents, or contractors with

1 whom the recipient may contract or subcontract, shall comply with the hiring preferences under
2 AS 36.10 for employment generated by the grant.

3 (k) In this section

4 (1) "appropriation" and "allocation" have the meaning defined for them in
5 AS 37.07.120;

6 (2) "local share" means the contribution required by (a) of this section; and

7 (3) "municipality" has the meaning set out in AS 29.71.800(13).

8 * Sec. 2. AS 37.05.318 is repealed and reenacted to read:

9 Sec. 37.05.318. REGULATIONS AND AUDITS. Subject to the Administrative
10 Procedure Act (AS 44.62), the Fiscal Procedures Act (AS 37.65), the Executive Budget Act
11 (AS 37.07), and requirements of the federal government for participation in federal programs, the
12 Department of Administration may adopt regulations and impose additional requirements or
13 procedures, including provisions for mandatory auditing and reporting, in order to implement,
14 interpret, make specific, or otherwise carry out the provisions of AS 37.05.315 - 37.05.322.

15 * Sec. 3. AS 44.47 is amended by adding a new section to art. 3 to read:

16 Sec. 44.47.195. UNINCORPORATED COMMUNITY CAPITAL PROJECT MATCHING
17 GRANT PROGRAM AND FUND. (a) The unincorporated community capital project matching
18 grant program and fund is established within the Department of Community and Regional Affairs.
19 Subject to annual appropriations to the fund, unincorporated communities entitled to receive state
20 aid under AS 29.60.140 are eligible to receive a grant under this section. The amount of each
21 unincorporated community's grant shall be determined by dividing the annual appropriation for
22 the program by the number of communities eligible for the program. Amounts for each
23 community shall be allocated to individual accounts within the fund. An unincorporated
24 community receiving a grant under this section may draw amounts from its account for purposes
25 of planning, design, and construction of capital projects or capital improvements, as defined in
26 AS 37.07.120, that will be used for a public purpose. For each draw, the grantee must make a
27 contribution, as provided under (f) of this section, to pay for the local share of the project or
28 improvement financed by the draw.

29 (b) Except as provided in (d) and (h) of this section, money appropriated to the fund
30 established in (a) of this section remains in the fund until drawn against by grantees. Interest
31 earned on grant money in the fund accrues to the general fund.

1 (c) In accepting a grant under (a) of this section, a grantee covenants with the state that
2 it will operate and maintain the capital projects and capital improvements for which the grant is
3 used for the practical life of those projects or improvements, and that the grantee will not rely
4 on the state to operate or maintain those projects or improvements or pay for operation or
5 maintenance. This requirement does not apply to use of the grant money for repair or
6 improvement of an existing facility that is operated or maintained by the state at the time that
7 a draw against the grant for that purpose is taken, if the repair or improvement for which the
8 grant is used will not substantially increase the operating or maintenance costs to the state.

9 (d) The department, with advice from the Department of Law, shall determine whether
10 there is in each unincorporated community an incorporated nonprofit entity or a Native village
11 council that will agree to receive and spend grant money awarded under (a) of this section. If
12 there is more than one qualified entity in an unincorporated community, the department shall pay
13 the money awarded under (a) of this section to the entity that the department finds most qualified
14 to receive and spend the money. The department may not pay the money to a Native village
15 council unless the council waives immunity from suit for claims arising out of activities of the
16 council related to the grant award. A waiver of immunity from suit under this subsection must
17 be on a form provided by the Department of Law. If there is no qualified incorporated nonprofit
18 entity or Native village council in an unincorporated community that is willing to receive money
19 for a grant awarded under (a) of this section, the grant award for that unincorporated community
20 may not be paid and the amount of the award lapses to the general fund. Neither this subsection
21 nor any action taken under it enlarges or diminishes the governmental authority or jurisdiction
22 of a Native village council.

23 (e) Subject to appropriation, a grant awarded under (a) of this section may not be less
24 than \$15,000.

25 (f) The local share required under (a) of this section is 10 percent of the cost of the
26 planning, design, and construction for which the draw is taken under (a) of this section.

27 (g) For purposes of (a) of this section, the local share may be satisfied from federal or
28 local money, locally contributed manpower, materials or equipment the value of which has been
29 established by the Department of Community and Regional Affairs, or money from any other
30 non-state source. The local share may not be satisfied from money derived from appropriations,
31 allocations, entitlements, grants, or payments from the state.

1 (h) An unincorporated community shall repay amounts drawn from a grant awarded under
2 (a) of this section for use on a capital project or improvement to the grantee's account established
3 under (a) of this section if substantial, ongoing work on the project or improvement is not started
4 within five years after the effective date of the appropriation of the grant. An appropriation or
5 allocation for a grant lapses to the general fund if no draw is taken against a grant awarded under
6 (a) of this section for a period of five years.

7 (i) An unincorporated community or entity receiving a grant under (a) of this section, or
8 agents, or contractors with whom the community or entity may contract or subcontract, shall
9 comply with the hiring preferences provided under AS 36.10 for employment generated by the
10 grant.

11 (j) Subject to the Administrative Procedure Act (AS 44.62), the Fiscal Procedures Act
12 (AS 37.05), the Executive Budget Act (AS 37.07), and requirements of the federal government
13 for participation in federal programs, the Department of Community and Regional Affairs may
14 adopt regulations and impose additional requirements or procedures, including provisions for
15 mandatory auditing and reporting, in order to implement, interpret, make specific, or otherwise
16 carry out the provisions of this section.

17 (k) The limitations set out in AS 44.47.140 do not apply to grants made under this
18 section.

19 (l) In this section

20 (1) "appropriation" and "allocation" have the meaning set out in AS 37.07.120;

21 (2) "local share" means the matching contribution required by (a) of this section;

22 and

23 (3) "unincorporated community" has the meaning set out in AS 29.60.140(b).

24 * Sec. 4. This Act takes effect July 1, 1991.

SENATE BILL NO. 142

IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

SEVENTEENTH LEGISLATURE - FIRST SESSION

BY THE SENATE RULES COMMITTEE BY REQUEST OF THE GOVERNOR

Introduced: 2/25/91
 Referred: Finance
 Funding Information: General Fund \$ 60,000,000

A BILL

FOR AN ACT ENTITLED

1 "An Act making special appropriations for a capital project matching grant program for
 2 municipalities and unincorporated communities; and providing for an effective date."

3 BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:

4 * Section 1. The sum of \$58,830,000 is appropriated from the general fund to the municipal capital
 5 project matching grant fund for grants for capital projects and capital improvements for municipalities
 6 under AS 37.05.322. The anticipated allocations are as follows:

7	Akhiok	\$25,000
8	Akiak	28,776
9	Akutan	47,996
10	Alakanuk	62,773
11	Aleknagik	25,000
12	Aleutians East Borough	25,000
13	Allakaket	25,000
14	Ambler	34,331

1	Anaktuvuk Pass	28,220
2	Anchorage, Municipality of	24,770,319
3	Anderson	70,550
4	Angoon	76,105
5	Aniak	61,995
6	Anvik	25,000
7	Atka	25,000
8	Atkasuk	24,998
9	Barrow	375,416
10	Bethel	487,740
11	Bettles	25,000
12	Brevig Mission	25,000
13	Bristol Bay Borough	161,210
14	Buckland	33,553
15	Chefornak	33,220
16	Chevak	65,995
17	Chignik	25,000
18	Chuathbaluk	25,000
19	Clark's Point	25,000
20	Coffman Cove	25,000
21	Cold Bay	25,000
22	Cordova	290,978
23	Craig	136,767
24	Deering	25,000
25	Delta Junction	131,657
26	Dillingham	247,981
27	Diomedede	25,000
28	Eagle	25,000
29	Eek	30,998
30	Ekwok	25,000
31	Elim	32,664

1	Emmonak	74,994
2	Fairbanks	3,138,759
3	Fairbanks North Star Borough	4,721,859
4	Fort Yukon	71,328
5	Galena	103,103
6	Gambell	57,773
7	Golovin	25,000
8	Goodnews Bay	25,554
9	Grayling	25,331
10	Haines	128,879
11	Haines Borough	187,208
12	Holy Cross	30,664
13	Homer	481,963
14	Ileonah	99,326
15	Hooper Bay	89,660
16	Houston	81,994
17	Hughes	25,000
18	Huslia	24,998
19	Hydaburg	50,774
20	Juneau, City and Borough of	3,327,078
21	Kachemak	46,441
22	Kake	75,328
23	Kaktovik	24,887
24	Kaltag	29,775
25	Kasaan	25,000
26	Kenai	726,944
27	Kenai Peninsula Borough	2,431,591
28	Ketchikan	858,823
29	Ketchikan Gateway Borough	510,183
30	Kiana	45,996
31	King Cove	87,771

1	Kivalina	33,109
2	Klawock	99,659
3	Kobuk	25,000
4	Kodiak	752,609
5	Kodiak Island Borough	857,267
6	Kotlik	50,218
7	Kotzebue	411,635
8	Koyuk	24,887
9	Koyukuk	25,000
10	Kupreanof	25,000
11	Kwethluk	60,106
12	Lake and Peninsula Borough	133,101
13	Larsen Bay	25,000
14	Lower Kalskag	30,331
15	Manokotak	41,108
16	Marshall	32,664
17	Matanuska-Susitna Borough	3,434,958
18	McGrath	59,218
19	Mekoryuk	25,000
20	Mountain Village	82,438
21	Napakiak	34,997
22	Napaskiak	36,775
23	Nenana	61,662
24	New Stuyahok	41,552
25	Newhalen	25,000
26	Nikolai	25,000
27	Nome	478,074
28	Nondalton	25,442
29	Noorvik	66,662
30	North Pole	178,875
31	North Slope Borough	253,869

1	Northwest Arctic Borough	34,997
2	Nuiqsut	35,997
3	Nuiato	40,219
4	Nunapitchuk	41,330
5	Old Harbor	35,775
6	Ouzinkie	25,000
7	Palmer	331,974
8	Pelican	27,887
9	Petersburg	382,193
10	Pilot Station	50,552
11	Point Hope	67,773
12	Port Alexander	25,000
13	Port Heiden	25,000
14	Port Lions	33,331
15	Quinhagak	55,440
16	Ruby	26,998
17	Russian Mission	29,553
18	Sand Point	110,325
19	Savoonga	56,773
20	Saxman	34,220
21	Scammon Bay	33,997
22	Selawik	74,661
23	Seldovia	62,773
24	Seward	314,309
25	Shageluk	25,000
26	Shaktoolik	25,000
27	Sheldon Point	25,000
28	Shishmaref	47,774
29	Shungnak	25,000
30	Sitka, City and Borough of	917,374
31	Skagway	78,216

1	Soldotna	414,746
2	St. George	25,000
3	St. Mary's	54,551
4	St. Michael	33,664
5	St. Paul	65,106
6	Stebbins	43,774
7	Tanana	45,996
8	Teller	26,331
9	Tenakee Springs	25,000
10	Thorne Bay	58,329
11	Togiak	79,216
12	Toksook Bay	49,552
13	Tuluksak	39,664
14	Unalakleet	82,216
15	Unalaska	251,647
16	Upper Kalskag	25,000
17	Valdez	799,161
18	Wainwright	56,885
19	Wales	25,000
20	Wasilla	371,305
21	White Mountain	25,000
22	Whittier	33,220
23	Wrangell	292,200
24	Yakutat	58,551

25 * Sec. 2. The sum of \$1,170,000 is appropriated from the general fund to the unincorporated
26 community capital project matching grant fund for grants for capital projects and capital improvements
27 for unincorporated communities under AS 44.47.195. The anticipated allocations are as follows:

28	Arctic Village	\$15,000
29	Beaver	15,000
30	Birch Creek	15,000
31	Central	15,000

1	Chalkyitsik	15,000
2	Chenega	15,000
3	Chicken	15,000
4	Chistochina	15,000
5	Chitina	15,000
6	Chuloonawick	15,000
7	Circle	15,000
8	Copper Center	15,000
9	Council	15,000
10	Crooked Creek	15,000
11	Deltana	15,000
12	Dot Lake	15,000
13	Dot Lake Services	15,000
14	Dry Creek	15,000
15	Eagle Village	15,000
16	Edna Bay	15,000
17	Ekuk	15,000
18	Elfin Cove	15,000
19	Evansville	15,000
20	Four Mile Road Community	15,000
21	Gakona	15,000
22	Glenallen	15,000
23	Gulkana	15,000
24	Gustavus	15,000
25	Hamilton	15,000
26	Healy Lake	15,000
27	Hollis	15,000
28	Hyder	15,000
29	Kenny Lake	15,000
30	King Island	15,000
31	Kipnuk	15,000

1	Klukwan	15,000
2	Koliganek	15,000
3	Kongiganak	15,000
4	Kwigillingok	15,000
5	Lime Village	15,000
6	Livengood	15,000
7	Manley Hot Springs	15,000
8	McCarthy	15,000
9	Mendeltna	15,000
10	Mentasta	15,000
11	Minchumina	15,000
12	Minto	15,000
13	Myers Chuck	15,000
14	Nikolski	15,000
15	Northway	15,000
16	Oscarville	15,000
17	Panguingue Creek	15,000
18	Paxson	15,000
19	Pitka's Point	15,000
20	Point Baker	15,000
21	Port Protection	15,000
22	Portage Creek	15,000
23	Rampart	15,000
24	Red Devil	15,000
25	Slana	15,000
26	Sleetmute	15,000
27	Solomon	15,000
28	Stevens Village	15,000
29	Stony River	15,000
30	Takotna	15,000
31	Tanacross	15,000

1	Tatitlek	15,000
2	Tazlina	15,000
3	Telida	15,000
4	Tetlin	15,000
5	Tok	15,000
6	Tolsona	15,000
7	Tonsina	15,000
8	Tuntutuliak	15,000
9	Twin Hills	15,000
10	Venetie	15,000
11	Whale Pass	15,000
12	Wiseman	15,000

13 * **Sec. 3.** This Act takes effect on the effective date of an Act establishing a capital project matching
14 grant program for municipalities and unincorporated communities.

Capital Project Matching Grant Program
Enabling Legislation
Office of the Governor

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS

I. SECTION ONE

Section 1 of the bill establishes the capital project matching grant program for municipalities, establishes a fund for the receipt and tracking of grant awards, describes how appropriations to the program will be allocated among grantees, and sets out the formula for determining grantees' local matching shares.

"Municipality" is defined in the bill to include all political subdivisions incorporated under the laws of Alaska that are home rule or general law cities, home rule or general law boroughs, or unified municipalities, per AS 29.71.800(13).

Under the approach taken in the legislation, incorporated boroughs are the instrumentalities for receiving and administering grants for projects affecting unincorporated communities that lie within borough boundaries.

Subsection (a)

This section establishes the grant program for municipalities, as well as a fund for holding and administering grants to municipalities, within the Department of Administration.

The section stipulates that the amount annually appropriated to the municipal fund will be allocated to municipal grantees pro rata on the basis of their population, and credited to individual accounts for them within the fund. Annual grant awards will accumulate, subject to the limitations in subsection (i).

The section also establishes the requirement that each time a grantee wishes to draw funds against its allocation, for a project or projects which it has identified, it must make a matching contribution per the formula set out in subsection (d).

Subsection (b)

This subsection stipulates that all money appropriated to the municipal fund remains in the fund until drawn by grantees, and that the fund's interest earnings are to be credited to the general fund.

Subsection (c)

This subsection essentially stipulates that grantees will be responsible for providing for the maintenance and operating costs of the projects or facilities financed by grants under this program, unless the State already has the responsibility and the cost of such will not rise substantially due to the effects of the grant project. This is the same requirement used in the State's current revenue sharing program.

Subsection (d)

The formula set out in this section calculates the local share, in dollars, required to match each draw that the municipal grantee makes on its grant balance. The general effect of the formula is that the larger a municipal grantee is in terms of its population, and the wealthier it is in terms of its per capita real and personal property valuation, the larger is its required local share for any draw of its grant funds; and vice versa.

The basic relationship reflected in the formula is that for each project, portion of a project, or group of projects - - i.e., for each use to which grant awards are put by a municipality - - the municipality should put up a share, and the State should put up a share. In practice, the State's share would be the amount of any particular draw by a grantee against its outstanding grant balance, and the grantee's share for that draw would be the local share defined in this subsection.

The ratio of the local share to the State share, for any given draw, is defined in this subsection as the grantee's local share factor. That is:

$$\text{Local Share Factor} = \frac{\text{Local Share (as a \%)}}{\text{State Share (as a \%)}}$$

The local share factor multiplied by the dollar amount of the given draw therefore equals the dollar amount due from the grantee as the local share for that draw, as shown below:

$$\text{Since: } \frac{\text{Local Share (in \$)}}{\text{State Share (in \$)}} = \frac{\text{Local Share (as a \%)}}{\text{State Share (as a \%)}}$$

$$\text{Then: } \text{Local Share (in \$)} = \frac{\text{Local Share (as a \%)}}{\text{State Share (as a \%)}} \times \text{State Share (in \$)}$$

$$* \text{ State Share (in \$)} = \text{Draw Amount}$$

Since the State share in dollars is known (the draw amount), and since, the local share and the State share must, when expressed as percentages, add up to 1, the major part of the local share formula is involved with determining the grantee's local share expressed as a percentage of the total proposed outlay - - i.e., with determining the grantee's local share percentage.

Calculation of the local share percentage is straightforward: it equals the product of the municipal grantee's population factor and its local wealth factor. Population factors for municipalities are designated in this subsection, according to municipal population sizes. The local wealth factor for a grantee is simply the grantee's per capita real and personal property valuation divided by the statewide average for all municipalities - - i.e., the grantee's per capita wealth relative to that of other municipalities, where the statewide average local wealth factor is 1.0.

The constraints on the local share factor contained in (d)(1)(B) and (d)(1)(C) ensure that the effective local share percentage for any grantee will not exceed 50 percent or be lower than 10 percent, per the limitations provided under subsection (f).

Subsection (d) also stipulates that if the grantee is an organized borough, the population and valuation data used in its local share formula calculation are to be net of the population and valuation components attributable to any incorporated municipality located within the borough. This reflects the approach taken in the design of this program that incorporated boroughs would be the instrumentalities responsible for receiving and administering grants for projects affecting unincorporated communities which are located within organized boroughs.

Subsection (e)

This subsection effectively stipulates that the minimum grant to a municipality under this program will be \$25 thousand per year, subject to the actual level of appropriation for the municipal program.

Subsection (f)

This subsection effectively limits the amount of the local share, by stipulating that the grantee's local share percentage as defined under subsection (d) can not exceed 50 percent, and can not be less than 10 percent.

Subsection (g)

This subsection stipulates that a grantee can use almost any source of money for its local share (with precise in-kind contributions effectively to be defined in regulations), except money from State sources.

Subsection (h)

This subsection stipulates that the population data and local valuation data used for municipal grantees shall be the same as that compiled and developed by the Department of Community and Regional Affairs for the State revenue sharing program.

Subsection (i)

This subsection stipulates that if a grantee makes no draws against a particular annual grant appropriation or allocation for five years, the money lapses into the general fund. It also stipulates that, once a draw has been made, progress on the project or projects for which the draw was made must be begun within five years of the draw, or else the drawn money must be returned to the grantee's account in the municipal grant fund, where it will remain available for later use by the grantee.

Subsection (j)

This subsection requires grantees and their contractors to adhere to the established hiring preferences and requirements for economically distressed or disadvantaged individuals, zones and geographic areas set out by the Department of Labor under AS 36.10.

Subsection (k)

This subsection contains several definitions essential for interpreting the provisions of Section 1 of the bill.

SECTION TWO

This section of the bill effectively repeals the existing prohibition against the promulgation of regulations and guidelines for existing grant programs for municipalities, unincorporated communities and named recipients, and explicitly allows the promulgation of regulations and guidelines for those programs as well as for the municipal grant program established under this bill.

SECTION THREE

Section 3 of the bill establishes the capital project matching grant program for unincorporated communities, establishes a fund for the receipt and tracking of grant awards, describes how appropriations to the program will be allocated among grantees, and sets out a fixed percentage for determining grantees' local matching shares.

"Unincorporated Community" is defined in the bill as any place in the unorganized borough that is not incorporated as a city and in which 25 or more persons reside as a social unit, per AS 29.60.140(b). This is the definition used in the Department of Community and Regional Affairs' state revenue sharing program.

Subsection (a)

This section establishes the grant program for unincorporated communities located in the unorganized borough, as well as a fund for holding and administering grants to those communities, within the Department of Community and Regional Affairs.

The section stipulates that the amount annually appropriated to the unincorporated community fund will be allocated to grantees pro rata on the basis of the number of unincorporated communities participating in the program, and credited to individual accounts for them within the fund. Annual grant awards will accumulate, subject to the limitations in subsections (d) and (h).

The section also establishes the requirement that each time a grantee wishes to draw funds against its allocation, for a project or projects which it has identified, it must make a matching contribution per the stipulation set out in subsection (f).

Subsection (b)

This subsection stipulates that all money appropriated to the unincorporated community fund remains in the fund until drawn by grantees, and that the fund's interest earnings are to be credited to the general fund.

Subsection (c)

This subsection essentially stipulates that grantees will be responsible for providing for the maintenance and operating costs of the projects or facilities financed by grants under this program, unless the State already has the responsibility and the cost of such will not rise substantially due to the effects of the grant project. This is the same requirement used in the State's current revenue sharing program.

Subsection (d)

This subsection essentially sets out the procedures which the Department of Community and Regional Affairs must use in identifying potential grant recipients for unincorporated communities. The procedures and limitations entailed are those currently required in the State revenue sharing program.

Subsection (e)

This subsection effectively stipulates that the minimum grant to an unincorporated community under this program will be \$15 thousand per year, subject to the actual level of appropriation for the municipal program.

Subsection (f)

This subsection stipulates that the required local share for unincorporated communities under this program is 10 percent of the sum of the local share and the draw taken.

Subsection (g)

This subsection stipulates that a grantee can use almost any source of money for its local share (with precise in-kind contributions effectively to be defined in regulations), except money from State sources.

Subsection (h)

This subsection stipulates that if a grantee makes no draws against a particular annual grant appropriation or allocation for five years, the money lapses into the general fund. It also stipulates that, once a draw has been made, progress on the project or projects for which the draw was made must be begun within five years of the draw, or else the drawn money must be returned to the grantee's account in the unincorporated community grant fund, where it will remain available for later use by the grantee.

Subsection (i)

This subsection requires grantees and their contractors to adhere to the established hiring preferences and requirements for economically distressed or disadvantaged individuals, zones and geographic areas set out by the Department of Labor under AS 36.10.

Subsection (j)

This subsection allows the promulgation of regulations and guidelines for unincorporated community matching grant program established under this bill.

Subsection (k)

This subsection stipulates that the program cost ceiling set in AS 44.47.140 does not apply to the unincorporated community matching grant program established under this bill.

Subsection (l)

This subsection contains several definitions essential for interpreting the provisions of Section 1 of the bill.

SECTION FOUR

This section of the bill sets the effective date for the capital projects matching grant program as the start of FY 1992.

CAPITAL PROJECT MATCHING GRANT PROGRAM

2/28/91

Local Share % = Col. C x Col. F

Total State Funds (\$000): 58,830.0
 Minimum State Share (\$000): 25.0
 Maximum Local Share (%): 50%
 Minimum Local Share (%): 10%

Population Factors:	Under 1,000	1,000-4,999	5,000-10,000	Over 10,000
	0.1	0.3	0.7	1.0

(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)
Community	Population	Population Factor	DCRA Assessed Full Value (\$)	Per Capita Value (\$)	Local Wealth Factor	LOCAL SHARE %	LOCAL SHARE \$000	STATE SHARE %	STATE SHARE \$000	Leverage Ratio
Akhlok	93	.1	1,758,000	18,903	0.267	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Akiak	259	.1	8,454,191	32,642	0.460	10.0%	3.2	90.0%	28.7	1.11
Akutan	432	.1	10,816,600	25,038	0.353	10.0%	5.3	90.0%	47.9	1.11
Alakanuk	565	.1	18,442,540	32,642	0.460	10.0%	7.0	90.0%	62.6	1.11
Aleknagik	159	.1	5,190,025	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Aleutians East Borough	69	.1	2,252,298	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Allakaket	202	.1	6,593,616	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Ambler	309	.1	3,469,100	11,227	0.158	10.0%	3.8	90.0%	34.2	1.11
Anaktuvuk Pass	254	.1	1,588,000	6,252	0.088	10.0%	3.1	90.0%	28.1	1.11
Anchorage, Municipality of	222,950	1.0	9,836,722,410	44,121	0.622	50.0%	24,695.6	50.0%	24,695.6	2.00
Anderson	635	.1	20,727,457	32,642	0.460	10.0%	7.8	90.0%	70.3	1.11
Angoon	685	.1	22,359,540	32,642	0.460	10.0%	8.4	90.0%	75.9	1.11
Aniak	558	.1	18,214,049	32,642	0.460	10.0%	6.9	90.0%	61.8	1.11
Anvik	89	.1	2,905,108	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Atka	90	.1	2,937,750	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Atkasuk	225	.1	1,925,000	8,556	0.121	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	24.9	1.11
Barrow	3,379	.3	49,341,100	14,602	0.206	10.0%	41.6	90.0%	374.3	1.11
Bethel	4,390	.3	161,980,500	41,453	0.585	17.5%	103.4	82.5%	486.3	1.21
Bettles	45	.1	1,468,875	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Brevig Mission	197	.1	6,430,408	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Bristol Bay Borough	1,451	.3	117,937,900	81,280	1.146	34.4%	84.2	65.6%	160.7	1.52
Buckland	502	.1	3,145,300	10,415	0.147	10.0%	3.7	90.0%	33.5	1.11
Chefornak	299	.1	9,759,858	32,642	0.460	10.0%	3.7	90.0%	33.1	1.11
Chevak	594	.1	19,389,149	32,642	0.460	10.0%	7.3	90.0%	65.8	1.11
Chignik	128	.1	8,709,200	68,041	0.959	10.0%	2.0	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Chuathbaluk	127	.1	4,145,491	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Clark's point	87	.1	2,839,825	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Coffman cove	195	.1	6,365,125	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Cold bay	158	.1	8,482,400	53,686	0.757	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Cordova	2,619	.3	122,992,900	46,962	0.662	19.9%	71.9	80.1%	290.1	1.25
Craig	1,231	.2	40,178,500	32,639	0.460	13.8%	21.8	86.2%	136.4	1.16
Deering	165	.1	1,867,700	11,319	0.160	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Delta Junction	1,185	.3	27,731,800	23,402	0.330	10.0%	14.6	90.0%	131.3	1.11

CAPITAL PROJECT MATCHING GRANT PROGRAM

2/20/91

Local Share % = Col. C x Col. F

Total State Funds (\$000): 58,830.0
 Minimum State Share (\$000): 25.0
 Maximum Local Share (%): 50%
 Minimum Local Share (%): 10%

Population Factors:	Under 1,000	1,000-4,999	5,000-10,000	Over 10,000
	0.1	0.3	0.7	1.0

(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)
Community	Population	Population Factor	DCRA Assessed Full Value (\$)	Per Capita Value (\$)	Local Wealth Factor	LOCAL SHARE %	\$000	STATE SHARE %	\$000	Leverage Ratio
Donali Borough	1,346	.3	74,435,000	55,301	0.780	23.4%	45.5	76.6%	149.1	1.31
Dillingham	2,232	.3	118,601,000	53,137	0.749	22.5%	71.7	77.5%	247.2	1.29
Diomedea	184	.1	6,006,066	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Eagle	174	.1	8,388,300	48,209	0.680	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Eek	279	.1	9,107,024	32,642	0.460	10.0%	3.4	90.0%	30.9	1.11
Ekwok	122	.1	3,982,283	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Elim	294	.1	9,596,649	32,642	0.460	10.0%	3.6	90.0%	32.6	1.11
Emmonak	675	.1	22,033,123	32,642	0.460	10.0%	8.3	90.0%	74.8	1.11
Fairbanks	28,251	1.0	1,071,624,900	37,932	0.535	50.0%	3,129.3	50.0%	3,129.3	2.00
Fairbanks North Star Borough	42,500	1.0	2,142,124,000	50,403	0.711	50.0%	4,707.6	50.0%	4,707.6	2.00
False Pass	69	.1	2,252,298	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Fort Yukon	642	.1	20,955,948	32,642	0.460	10.0%	7.9	90.0%	71.1	1.11
Galena	928	.1	19,585,100	21,105	0.298	10.0%	11.4	90.0%	102.8	1.11
Gambell	520	.1	16,973,665	32,642	0.460	10.0%	6.4	90.0%	57.6	1.11
Golovin	154	.1	5,026,816	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Goodnews Bay	230	.1	7,507,583	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.5	1.11
Grayling	228	.1	7,442,299	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.3	1.11
Haines	1,160	.3	51,001,500	43,967	0.620	18.6%	29.4	81.4%	128.5	1.23
Haines Borough	1,685	.3	52,886,700	31,387	0.443	13.3%	28.6	86.7%	186.6	1.15
Holy Cross	276	.1	9,009,099	32,642	0.460	10.0%	3.4	90.0%	30.6	1.11
Homer	4,338	.3	205,761,300	47,432	0.669	20.1%	120.6	79.9%	480.5	1.25
Hoonah	894	.1	21,586,000	24,145	0.340	10.0%	11.0	90.0%	99.0	1.11
Hooper Bay	807	.1	5,203,800	6,448	0.091	10.0%	9.9	90.0%	89.4	1.11
Houston	738	.1	33,028,500	44,754	0.631	10.0%	9.1	90.0%	81.7	1.11
Hughes	75	.1	2,448,125	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Huslia	225	.1	7,344,374	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	24.9	1.11
Hydaburg	457	.1	9,024,100	19,746	0.278	10.0%	5.6	90.0%	50.6	1.11
Juneau, City and Borough of	29,946	1.0	1,247,450,700	41,657	0.587	50.0%	3,317.0	50.0%	3,317.0	2.00
Kachemak	418	.1	17,954,400	42,953	0.606	10.0%	5.1	90.0%	46.3	1.11
Kake	678	.1	16,843,800	24,843	0.350	10.0%	8.3	90.0%	75.1	1.11
Kaktovik	224	.1	2,219,300	9,908	0.140	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Kaltag	268	.1	8,747,966	32,642	0.460	10.0%	3.3	90.0%	29.7	1.11
Kasaan	69	.1	2,252,275	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11

CAPITAL PROJECT MATCHING GRANT PROGRAM

2/28/91

Local Share % = Col. C x Col. F

Total State Funds (\$000): 58,830.0
 Minimum State Share (\$000): 25.0
 Maximum Local Share (%): 50%
 Minimum Local Share (%): 10%

Population Factors:	Under 1,000	1,000-4,999	5,000-10,000	Over 10,000
	0.1	0.3	0.7	1.0

(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)
Community	Population	Population Factor	DCRA Assessed Full Value (\$)	Per Capita Value (\$)	Local Wealth Factor	LOCAL SHARE %	LOCAL SHARE \$000	STATE SHARE %	STATE SHARE \$000	Leverage Ratio
Kenal	6,543	.7	281,331,400	42,997	0.606	42.4%	534.4	57.6%	724.8	1.74
Kenal Peninsula Borough	21,886	1.0	2,419,659,910	110,557	1.559	50.0%	2,424.3	50.0%	2,424.3	2.00
Ketchikan	7,730	.7	438,590,300	56,739	0.800	50.0%	856.2	50.0%	856.2	2.00
Ketchikan Gateway Borough	4,592	.3	367,375,500	80,003	1.128	33.8%	260.2	66.2%	508.6	1.51
Kiana	414	.1	5,051,900	12,203	0.172	10.0%	5.1	90.0%	45.9	1.11
King Cove	790	.1	29,189,900	36,949	0.521	10.0%	0.7	90.0%	87.5	1.11
Kivalina	298	.1	3,388,600	11,371	0.160	10.0%	3.7	90.0%	33.0	1.11
Klawock	897	.1	9,194,000	10,250	0.145	10.0%	11.0	90.0%	99.4	1.11
Kobuk	87	.1	1,102,900	12,677	0.179	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Kodiak	6,774	.7	438,935,900	64,797	0.914	50.0%	750.3	50.0%	750.3	2.00
Kodiak Island Borough	7,716	.7	185,178,500	23,999	0.338	23.7%	265.3	76.3%	854.7	1.31
Kotlik	452	.1	14,754,032	32,642	0.460	10.0%	5.6	90.0%	50.1	1.11
Kotzebue	3,705	.3	103,226,300	27,861	0.393	11.8%	54.8	88.2%	410.4	1.13
Koyuk	224	.1	7,311,733	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Koyukuk	138	.1	4,504,550	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Kupreanof	52	.1	1,697,367	32,642	0.450	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Kwethluk	541	.1	17,659,140	32,642	0.460	10.0%	6.7	90.0%	59.9	1.11
Lake and Peninsula Borough	1,198	.3	41,579,700	34,708	0.489	14.7%	22.8	85.3%	132.7	1.17
Larsen Bay	149	.1	3,268,300	21,935	0.309	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Lower Kalskag	273	.1	8,911,174	32,642	0.460	10.0%	3.4	90.0%	30.2	1.11
Manokotak	370	.1	12,077,416	32,642	0.460	10.0%	4.6	90.0%	41.0	1.11
Marshall	294	.1	9,596,649	32,642	0.460	10.0%	3.6	90.0%	32.6	1.11
Matanuska-Susitna Borough	30,917	1.0	1,447,950,990	46,833	0.660	50.0%	3,424.6	50.0%	3,424.6	2.00
McGrath	533	.1	17,398,007	32,642	0.460	10.0%	6.6	90.0%	59.0	1.11
Mekoryuk	190	.1	6,201,916	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Mountain Village	742	.1	24,220,115	32,642	0.460	10.0%	9.1	90.0%	82.2	1.11
Napakiak	315	.1	10,282,124	32,642	0.460	10.0%	3.9	90.0%	34.9	1.11
Napaskiak	331	.1	10,804,391	32,642	0.460	10.0%	4.1	90.0%	36.7	1.11
Nenana	555	.1	16,186,800	29,165	0.411	10.0%	6.8	90.0%	61.5	1.11
New Stuyahok	374	.1	12,207,982	32,642	0.460	10.0%	4.6	90.0%	41.4	1.11
Newhalen	168	.1	3,602,800	21,445	0.302	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Nikolai	113	.1	3,688,508	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Nome	4,303	.3	137,990,000	32,068	0.452	13.6%	74.8	86.4%	476.6	1.16

CAPITAL PROJECT MATCHING GRANT PROGRAM

2/28/91

Local Share % = Col. C x Col. F

Total State Funds (\$000): 58,830.0
 Minimum State Share (\$000): 25.0
 Maximum Local Share (%): 50%
 Minimum Local Share (%): 10%

Population Factors:	Under 1,000	1,000-4,999	5,000-10,000	Over 10,000
	0.1	0.3	0.7	1.0

(A) Community	(B) Population	(C) Population Factor	(D) DCRA Assessed Full Value (\$)	(E) Per Capita Value (\$)	(F) Local Wealth Factor	(G) LOCAL SHARE %	(H) LOCAL SHARE \$000	(I) STATE SHARE %	(J) STATE SHARE \$000	(K) Leverage Ratio
Nondalton	229	.1	3,804,400	16,613	0.234	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.4	1.11
Noorvik	600	.1	6,457,500	10,763	0.152	10.0%	7.4	90.0%	66.5	1.11
North Pole	1,610	.3	184,583,000	114,648	1.617	48.5%	167.9	51.5%	178.3	1.94
North Slope Borough	2,285	.3	11,883,976,500	5,200,865	73.335	50.0%	253.1	50.0%	253.1	2.00
Northwest Arctic Borough	315	.1	4,110,500	13,049	0.184	10.0%	3.9	90.0%	34.9	1.11
Nulqsut	324	.1	11,996,900	37,027	0.522	10.0%	4.0	90.0%	35.9	1.11
Nulato	362	.1	11,816,282	32,642	0.460	10.0%	4.5	90.0%	40.1	1.11
Nunapitchuk	372	.1	12,142,699	32,642	0.460	10.0%	4.6	90.0%	41.2	1.11
Old Harbor	322	.1	5,787,400	17,973	0.253	10.0%	4.0	90.0%	35.7	1.11
Ouzinkie	204	.1	3,245,100	15,907	0.224	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Palmer	2,988	.3	104,192,300	34,870	0.492	14.8%	57.3	85.2%	331.0	1.17
Pelican	251	.1	10,440,800	41,597	0.587	10.0%	3.1	90.0%	27.8	1.11
Petersburg	3,440	.3	162,441,900	47,221	0.666	20.0%	95.1	80.0%	381.0	1.25
Pilot Station	455	.1	14,851,957	32,642	0.460	10.0%	5.6	90.0%	50.4	1.11
Point Hope	610	.1	7,034,600	11,532	0.163	10.0%	7.5	90.0%	67.6	1.11
Port Alexander	119	.1	3,884,358	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Port Heiden	121	.1	2,675,400	22,111	0.312	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Port Lions	300	.1	6,969,600	23,232	0.328	10.0%	3.7	90.0%	33.2	1.11
Quinhagak	499	.1	16,288,190	32,642	0.460	10.0%	6.1	90.0%	55.3	1.11
Ruby	243	.1	7,931,924	32,642	0.460	10.0%	3.0	90.0%	26.9	1.11
Russian Mission	266	.1	8,682,683	32,642	0.460	10.0%	3.3	90.0%	29.5	1.11
Sand Point	993	.1	39,039,700	39,315	0.554	10.0%	12.2	90.0%	110.0	1.11
Savoonga	511	.1	16,679,890	32,642	0.460	10.0%	6.3	90.0%	56.6	1.11
Saxman	308	.1	13,305,600	43,200	0.609	10.0%	3.8	90.0%	34.1	1.11
Scammon Bay	306	.1	9,988,349	32,642	0.460	10.0%	3.8	90.0%	33.9	1.11
Selawik	672	.1	7,930,700	11,802	0.166	10.0%	8.3	90.0%	74.4	1.11
Seldovia	565	.1	21,089,400	37,326	0.526	10.0%	7.0	90.0%	62.6	1.11
Seward	2,829	.3	139,627,200	49,356	0.696	20.9%	82.7	79.1%	313.4	1.26
Shageluk	152	.1	4,961,533	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Shaktolik	197	.1	6,430,408	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Sheldon Point	131	.1	4,276,058	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Shishmaref	430	.1	14,035,916	32,642	0.460	10.0%	5.3	90.0%	47.6	1.11
Shungnak	214	.1	2,963,300	13,847	0.195	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11

CAPITAL PROJECT MATCHING GRANT PROGRAM

2/28/91

Local Share % = Col. C x Col. F

Total State Funds (\$000): 58,830.0
 Minimum State Share (\$000): 25.0
 Maximum Local Share (%): 50%
 Minimum Local Share (%): 10%

Population	Under	1,000-	5,000-	Over
Factors:	1,000	4,999	10,000	10,000
	0.1	0.3	0.7	1.0

(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)
Community	Population	Population Factor	DCRA Assessed Full Value (\$)	Per Capita Value (\$)	Local Wealth Factor	LOCAL SHARE %	LOCAL SHARE \$000	STATE SHARE %	STATE SHARE \$000	Leverage Ratio
Sitka, City and Borough of	8,257	.7	446,849,500	54,118	0.763	50.0%	914.6	50.0%	914.6	2.00
Skagway	704	.1	54,411,100	77,288	1.090	10.9%	9.5	89.1%	78.0	1.12
Soldotna	3,733	.3	200,457,100	53,699	0.757	22.7%	121.5	77.3%	413.5	1.29
St. George	188	.1	6,136,633	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
St. Mary's	491	.1	4,184,700	8,523	0.120	10.0%	6.0	90.0%	54.4	1.11
St. Michael	303	.1	9,890,424	32,642	0.460	10.0%	3.7	90.0%	33.6	1.11
St. Paul	586	.1	19,128,015	32,642	0.460	10.0%	7.2	90.0%	64.9	1.11
Stebbins	394	.1	12,860,816	32,642	0.460	10.0%	4.8	90.0%	43.6	1.11
Tanana	414	.1	11,511,900	27,807	0.392	10.0%	5.1	90.0%	45.9	1.11
Teller	237	.1	7,736,074	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.9	90.0%	26.3	1.11
Tenakee Springs	108	.1	3,525,300	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Thorne Bay	525	.1	17,136,874	32,642	0.460	10.0%	6.5	90.0%	58.2	1.11
Togalak	713	.1	23,273,507	32,642	0.460	10.0%	8.8	90.0%	79.0	1.11
Toksook Bay	446	.1	14,558,182	32,642	0.460	10.0%	5.5	90.0%	49.4	1.11
Tuluksak	357	.1	11,653,074	32,642	0.460	10.0%	4.4	90.0%	39.5	1.11
Unalakleet	740	.1	24,154,832	32,642	0.460	10.0%	9.1	90.0%	62.0	1.11
Unalaska	2,265	.3	116,125,240	51,269	0.723	21.7%	69.5	78.3%	250.9	1.28
Upper Kalskag	149	.1	4,863,608	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Vakdez	7,193	.7	1,370,370,900	190,515	2.686	50.0%	796.8	50.0%	796.8	2.00
Wainwright	512	.1	3,692,900	7,213	0.102	10.0%	6.3	90.0%	56.7	1.11
Wales	161	.1	5,255,308	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Wasilla	3,342	.3	228,384,700	68,338	0.964	28.9%	150.5	71.1%	370.2	1.41
White Mountain	180	.1	5,875,500	32,642	0.460	10.0%	2.8	90.0%	25.0	1.11
Whittier	299	.1	18,415,600	61,591	0.868	10.0%	3.7	90.0%	33.1	1.11
Wrangell	2,630	.3	110,198,000	41,900	0.591	17.7%	62.8	82.3%	291.3	1.22
Yakutat	527	.1	19,792,100	37,555	0.530	10.0%	6.5	90.0%	58.4	1.11
TOTAL:	158		527,553.			45%	48,495.8	55%	58,830.0	1.82

STATEWIDE AVERAGE:

\$70,919 1.000

CAPITAL PROJECT MATCHING GRANT PROGRAM

2/28/01

Local Share % = Col. C x Col. F

Total State Funds (\$000): 58,830.0
 Minimum State Share (\$000): 25.0
 Maximum Local Share (%): 50%
 Minimum Local Share (%): 10%

Population	Under	1,000-	5,000-	Over
Factors:	1,000	4,999	10,000	10,000
	0.1	0.3	0.7	1.0

(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)
Community	Population	Population Factor	DCRA Assessed Full Value (\$)	Per Capita Value (\$)	Local Wealth Factor	LOCAL SHARE %	STATE SHARE %	STATE SHARE \$000	Leverage Ratio	

NOTES:

Col. A - Excludes unincorporated communities outside boroughs, Metlakatla, and seven incorporated communities of uncertain dissolution status (Akiachak, Atmautluak, Kasigluk, Newtok, Nightmute, Platinum and Tununak).

Col. B - Population figures shown are those used by DCRA for the FY 91 State revenue sharing program.

Col. D - Taxable property full and true value, including oil and gas property, as established by DCRA (State Assessor).

Col. E - Communities showing a per capita value of \$32,642 are communities with population less than 750 people whose full value (Col. D) has not been assessed. DCRA establishes full values for these communities by calculating a weighted average per capita full valuation for all communities of less than 750 population for which assessments have been made, and multiplying that per capita full value by the populations of the former set of unassessed communities to produce full values for them. Generally, but not exclusively, these unassessed communities lie within the Unorganized Borough, while the set of assessed communities of population less than 750 lies within organized boroughs.

Col. F - Equals local per capita value (Col. E) divided by the statewide average per capita value (bottom of Col. E).

Col. G - Equals product of population factor (Col. C) and local wealth factor (Col. F). The minimum and maximum local shares (percentages) of project cost are shown with the assumptions above the table.

Col. I - Equals 1 minus the local share (Col. G).

Col. J - Equals pro rata share of Total State Funds, based on local population, net of instances where the Minimum State Share (shown above table) is applied.

Col. K - Equals 1 divided by the state share percentage (Col. I).

Source: OMB/JF

File: CAPITAL3.XLS

CAPITAL PROJECT MATCHING GRANT PROGRAM

2/25/91

Local Share % = Col. C x Col. F

Total State Funds (\$000): 58,830.0
 Minimum State Share (\$000): 25.0
 Maximum Local Share (%): 50%
 Minimum Local Share (%): 10%

Population Factors:	Under 1,000	1,000-4,999	5,000-10,000	Over 10,000
	0.1	0.3	0.7	1.0

(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)
Community	Population	Population Factor	DCRA Assessed Full Value (\$)	Per Capita Value (\$)	Local Wealth Factor	LOCAL SHARE %	\$000	STATE SHARE %	\$000	Leverage Ratio

NOTES:

- Col. A - Excludes unincorporated communities outside boroughs, Metlakatla, and seven incorporated communities of uncertain dissolution status (Aklachak, Atmautluak, Kasigluk, Newtok, Nighimute, Platinum and Tununak).
- Col. B - Population figures shown are those used by DCRA for the FY 91 State revenue sharing program.
- Col. D - Taxable property full and true value, including oil and gas property, as established by DCRA (State Assessor).
- Col. E - Communities showing a per capita value of \$32,642 are communities with population less than 750 people whose full value (Col. D) has not been assessed. DCRA establishes full values for these communities by calculating a weighted average per capita full valuation for all communities of less than 750 population for which assessments have been made, and multiplying that per capita full value by the populations of the former set of unassessed communities to produce full values for them. Generally, but not exclusively, these unassessed communities lie within the Unorganized Borough, while the set of assessed communities of population less than 750 lies within organized boroughs.
- Col. F - Equals local per capita value (Col. E) divided by the statewide average per capita value (bottom of Col. E).
- Col. G - Equals product of population factor (Col. C) and local wealth factor (Col. F). The minimum and maximum local shares (percentages) of project cost are shown with the assumptions above the table.
- Col. I - Equals 1 minus the local share (Col. G).
- Col. J - Equals pro rata share of Total State Funds, based on local population, net of instances where the Minimum State Share (shown above table) is applied.
- Col. K - Equals 1 divided by the state share percentage (Col. I).

Source: OMB/JF

File: CAPITAL3.XLS

STEVE FRANK
DISTRICT K
SEAT A

119 N. Cushman, Rm. 213
Fairbanks, Alaska 99701

While in Juneau
P.O. Box V
Juneau, Alaska 99811
(907) 465-3709
Capitol Rm. 514

Alaska State Legislature



MEMORANDUM

MEMBER
Finance Committee
Resources Committee
Legislative Council
Special Committee on Banking &
Economic Development

VICE-CHAIR
Community & Regional
Affairs Committee

TO: Interested Individuals

FROM: Senator Steve Frank, Chairman
Senate Community & Regional Affairs Committee

RE: Senate C&RA Committee Hearing to take Public Testimony on
SB 141 - Matching Grants for Capital Projects
3:30 Tuesday - March 26

DATE: March 15, 1991

The Senate C&RA Committee will be continuing our hearings on the Governor's proposed Capital Matching Grants Program (SB 141). We will be teleconferencing the meeting to various Legislative Information Offices around the State and taking testimony from any individual who wishes to speak to the Committee.

Please contact the Legislative Information Office in your area if you want to have them hooked into this hearing via the teleconference network. Currently, we have Anchorage, Mat-Su, Fairbanks, Glennallen, Barrow, Nome, Kodiak Ketchikan, and Bethel as participating sites, but we can add them as necessary. If you do not have an LIO in your community we can make arrangements to connect you to the teleconference if you let us know.

Governor Hickel's Bill (SB 141) would require that local governments match, on a per capita wealth and population basis, state contributions for municipal and unincorporated communities capital projects.

Copies of the bill and back up material can be obtained from the Legislative Information Office in your area at the time of the hearing. If you have questions please call Rick Solie in my office at 465-3709.



SENATOR STEVE FRANK

Alaska State Legislature

119 N. Cushman, Rm. 213
Fairbanks, Alaska 99701
(907) 452-7624

P.O. Box V
Juneau, Alaska 99811
(907) 465-3709



Alaska State Legislature


SENATE

Official Business

P.O. Box V
State Capitol
Juneau, Alaska 99811

MEMORANDUM

TO: Interested Individuals

FROM:  Senator Steve Frank, Chair
Senate Community & Regional Affairs Committee

RE: Senate C&RA Committee Hearing on
SB 141 - Matching Grants for Capital Projects
3:30 Thursday - March 14

DATE: March 12, 1991

This Thursday we will be hearing from the Hickel Administration on the Governor's proposed Capital Matching Grants Program and will be teleconferencing the meeting to various Legislative Information Offices around the State on a "listen only" basis.

Please contact the Legislative Information Office in your area if you want to have them hooked into this hearing via the teleconference network. Currently, we have Anchorage, Mat-Su, Fairbanks, Kodiak and Bethel as participating sites, but we can add them as necessary.

Governor Hickel's Bill (SB 141) would require that local governments match, on a per capita wealth and population basis, state contributions for municipal and unincorporated communities capital projects.


The Committee will only be taking testimony from the Governor's Office and State Agencies in this meeting. However, we will be soliciting both written and oral testimony in subsequent hearings on this bill before we take any formal action.

Copies of the bill and back up material can be obtained from the Legislative Information Office in your area at the time of the hearing. If you have questions please call Rick Solie in my office at 465-3709.

CITY OF PALMER



231 W. EVERGREEN AVE.
PALMER, ALASKA 99645



Phone (907) 745-3271

A HOME RULE CITY

MAR 21 1991

March 18, 1991

The Honorable Steve Frank
Senate Community and Regional
Affairs Committee
Box V
Juneau, Alaska 99811

RE: SB 141 - Matching Grants for Capital Projects

Dear Senator Frank,

Thursday, March 14, 1991 you began the hearings on SB 141 - Matching Grants for Capital Projects.

First, let me say that the City of Palmer is very much in favor of a matching grant program and has been for the past several years. A matching grant program makes the capital project decision a meaningful exercise for each community, whether big or small, and sets the priorities for years to come. At the same time, if your money is invested in a project, more particular attention is paid to the operation and maintenance costs associated with the project. So often, a capital project is constructed and the operation and maintenance costs are not considered until after the fact, causing unanticipated financial problems.

As I have read through SB 141, I do have a couple of questions which may need clarification or interpretation. Particularly, Section 37.05.322 (c) (line 10) "and the grantee will not rely on the state to operate or maintain those projects or improvements or pay for operation and maintenance." For example, if the City of Palmer chose to spend its grant monies to construct new state offices within the City, would this present language preclude the City from having the State pay for the operation and maintenance costs? Presently, the City leases buildings to the Department of Corrections, Department of Public Safety and Alaska Court System for use, whereby the lease covers only the operation and maintenance costs and debt service if applicable. As I read this section and interpret it, I believe any future enlargement of the aforementioned facilities would put the

The Honorable Steve Frank - March 18, 1991
Page 2

onus upon the City of Palmer to pay for the operation and maintenance costs.

In Section 37.05.322 (g) (line 15, page 3) "the local share may be satisfied from federal or municipal money, locally contributed manpower, materials, or equipment the value of which has been established by the Department of Administration." The question is the use of municipally or locally owned equipment used on the project for example, a backhoe, bulldozer, dump truck, etc., or tool whether power or manual. The Department of Transportation and Public Facilities has established rental rates for all the State owned equipment which we use for billing purposes associated with our State Highway maintenance contracts. A similar rental rate schedule should be allowed so that we are talking apples and apples when it comes to "in-kind services."

The concept which allows the grantees to roll these grants over for up to a five year period gives the flexibility to make decisive plans for capital projects.

The City of Palmer supports SB 141 and urges its passage as a means to allow all recipients to begin a thoughtful process of making major capital improvements to their locale.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Yours truly,

David L. Soulak
City Manager
City of Palmer

DLS/cac

cc: Senator Kerttula
Senator Menard
Representative Carney
Representative Larson
Scott Burgess, AML

1) The bill as written has the smaller villages too low as compared to the larger villages. Especially the unincorporated villages which are given fifteen thousand dollars no matter what the population of the village is. An effort should be made to bring that amount up and give them a population factor.

2) The economies of scale factor that separate the larger population areas and the smaller ones needs to be addressed. Some kind of sliding scale formula needs to be made to bring it somewhere close to being fair. I can see this bill as written is as much a 3 or 4: 1 out of line although yours probably can't make that big of adjustment.

3) Small villages will have to save their yearly amounts to accumulate enough to build anything of significance and so the amount will be from \$200,000 on up. That presents an almost insurmountable obstacle in my view for the local share portion to be accumulated. Some mechanism needs to be made where it's possible to use the interest. (Constitutional problems on dedicated funds) or some kind of sliding scale downward on the local share which would match what the interest would have brought in for the account.

4) Also in general I believe the matching portions as the progress upward toward the 50% match is too high. I don't know what the number should be, but it might hang up the bill.

5) Also this bill is a very good vehicle to use the local share as an incentive to use "Home grown products." I'm not just talking about trading goods, I'm talking about things like Alaska forest products, Alaska petroleum products like asphalt that is produced at MAPCO ect. This is a resource state an too many of our dollars leave the state that could stay here longer and turn over more to produce more business development. Boardwalks are a thing that immediately comes to mind. In the Kuskokwim and Yukon Delta, all them board walks are bought in the lower 48 and transported at great cost and just assembled at the village yet on both rivers miles of forest is there and a few sawmills with limited business. Community halls could be constructed using local resources ect.

6) Also sec 2. of the bill can cause some problems as it should probably be made to apply only to this bill.

Rural development needs attention

by Gov. Walter J. Hickel
for the Tundra Times

Last month, several of my Cabinet members gathered in my office to discuss rural development. I repeated my pledge from the State of the State message that helping our villages and small communities is one of my top priorities, both in terms of jobs and in resolving the subsistence challenge.

After a spirited discussion, we established a Rural Development Task Force among these Cabinet officials. The group is led by Edgar Blatchford, commissioner of Community and Regional Affairs. It also includes Glenn Olds, commissioner of Commerce and Economic Development, Harold Heinze, commissioner of Natural Resources, John Sandor, commissioner of Environmental Conservation, and Carl Rosier, commissioner of Fish and Game.

OPINION

I have charged this group to develop a wide range of strategies to reach out to those villages and communities that want to strengthen their economies and develop local resources for local people.

In some ways, this effort is reminiscent of one of my first acts when I became governor in 1967. I formed the Rural Affairs Commission.

Staffed by Morris Thompson (who later went to Washington, D.C., as my special assistant for Indian affairs when I became Secretary of the Interior), the Rural Affairs Commission became a vehicle for the voices of the Native community to be heard.



Gov. Walter J. Hickel

One result was the creation of a Remote Housing Program through which Native leaders developed their own housing ideas.

They traveled to Washington, D.C. to apply for federal funds and became involved in the design of housing that more closely fit the needs of the villages.

In the spring of that year I was informed that there was a need for a school at Pitkas Point, on the Lower Yukon.

This village had never had an elementary school. When I demanded to know why government hadn't done something, officials claimed they would need two years to design and construct a new facility. Furthermore, the appropriated funds for the school had been impounded by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

We refused to be stopped.

I suggested that the villages build a school on their own time, using their own materials, and we would provide

direct assistance.

"Let's do it on our own," I said.

The school was completed in less than four months and it opened the following fall.

It was built entirely by local citizens with materials at hand and cost slightly over one-tenth of the federal government estimate.

When I visited Pitkas Point to see the school, I discovered that both the parents and the students felt a special fondness for the new building. They had a sense of ownership. It was not something prefabricated and flown in from somewhere else at great government expense.

I will never forget walking by the school building with the children. They just reached out with their hands and gently stroked the logs in the walls.

We found a similar situation in Tanana, where the community needed a sawmill. We provided the saw assembly, and local residents hewed their own logs and built the mill.

'It was not a grandiose program involving thousands of people. It was simply putting tools in the hands of individuals.'

It was not a grandiose program involving thousands of people. It was simply putting tools in the hands of individuals so they could implement their own ideas.

When I visited Tanana, I could see the dignity of the people working that mill.

They asked, "Governor, how long can we keep it?"

I replied, "As long as you keep it busy."

Soon they built a community hall and began several other projects.



This approach is still valid today. Yes, we need some major projects to help the long-term projects for Alaska's economy.

Some extended rail lines would particularly help certain parts of rural Alaska where mineral deposits require a surface transportation system.

But in addition, we need dozens, perhaps hundreds, of little projects like the ones in Pitkas Point and Tanana.

Commissioner Blatchford has reported to me that his department is brimming with ideas along this line that are already being generated.

To address the subsistence issue, we have formed an advisory council that is working to find a solution all Alaskans can support.

Former Gov. Jay Hammond, Gene Peltola, Mitch Denicoff and Matthew Iya are several of the members most knowledgeable of the subsistence user.

I have personally attended each of the work sessions and we have developed a positive working relationship as Alaskans dedicated to finding an answer that will bring all Alaskans together as "one country, one people."

Anch, PAI, Kod, Bethel
+ Mat-Su

C&RA COMMITTEE CHECK LIST

TCF # 9103-053
10 lines

Bill: SB 141
Sponsor: Senator Rules by
Date In: 2-25-91 request
Schedule Memo: _____ of
GWN

1) Agency Position Papers: _____

2) Fiscal Notes: _____

3) Sectional Analysis:

4) Other Backup:



Alaska State Legislature


SENATE

Official Business

P.O. Box V
State Capitol
Juneau, Alaska 99811

MEMORANDUM

TO: Senate C&RA Committee Members

FROM:  Senator Steve Frank, Chairman
Senate C&RA Committee

RE: Committee Substitute for SB 141 - Matching Grants For
Capital Projects

DATE: April 17, 1991

In our hearings on SB 141, we have taken testimony from around the state. It has become apparent that the legislation, while a good first step, needed some refinements. Of particular interest is the higher cost of building in rural Alaska and the lack of economies of scale. I have attempted to address these and other issues in a proposed Committee Substitute.

Attached is a computer run that we requested from the Governor's Office of Management & Budget (OMB) showing the effects of the following changes to SB 141:

- 1) Decrease the maximum municipal match to 30%
and the minimum municipal match to 5%;

This was done in part, to make the match something more achievable for the communities while still requiring their financial participation. Also, I wanted to reduce the match amount in recognition of the in kind manpower contribution of many groups. However it seems very problematic to account for them, particularly if the groups were non profit organizations utilizing volunteers, so the language allowing "locally contributed manpower" was deleted.

- 2) Increase the minimum grant for unincorporated communities to \$25,000.

Bringing the unincorporated communities up to this level would put them in parity with the incorporated ones.

- 3) Changed the method for allocating the total dollar amount available by applying a weighting factor inversely proportional to the community size.

The factors used correspond to the population groups which OMB employed to allocate capital dollars in the original bill. The intent was to recognize the higher cost of construction in smaller communities.

According to OMB the effect of these changes is a shift of about 6 million dollars from larger municipalities to smaller ones and a reduction in the overall leverage ratio from 1.82 to 1.36.

STATE OF ALASKA

GOVERNOR
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

WALTER J. HICKEL,

P.O. BOX AM
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99811-0199
PHONE: (907)-465-3658
FAX: (907)-465-2090

April 11, 1991

Senator Steve Frank
Chairman, Community and Regional Affairs Committee
Alaska State Legislature
P.O. Box V (MS 3100)
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Dear Senator Frank:

Re: Modified Grant Allocations for Senate Bill 141
(Capital Project Matching Grant Program)

Per your request, attached are two projections showing grant allocations and local match requirements for municipalities (Table 1) and for unincorporated communities in the unorganized borough (Table 2), under a modified set of assumptions for Senate Bill 141. Apart from technical adjustments made by us for modeling purposes, explained below, the assumptions used for the projections were provided by Rick Solie of your staff.

The assumptions employed in Tables 1-2 are as follows:

- For municipalities (Table 1), the maximum local matching share has been reduced from 50 percent to 30 percent, and the minimum local matching share has been reduced from 10 percent to 5 percent.
- Also for municipalities (Table 1), the method for allocating the total amount available for municipalities has been changed. Where SB 141 as proposed employs a pro rata distribution among municipalities solely on the basis of their populations, the projection in Table 1 adjusts those pro rata shares by multiplying them by different weighting factors, depending on the size of their populations. Specifically, if a municipality's population is less than 1,000 persons, its pro rata share is multiplied by a factor of 1.5; if between 1,000 and 4,999 persons, by a factor of 1.4; if between 5,000 and 10,000 persons, by a factor of 1.2; and if more than 10,000 persons, not at all (i.e., by a factor of 1.0).
- For unincorporated communities in the unorganized borough (Table 2), the minimum grant amount has been increased from \$15,000 to \$25,000.


One overall effect of these changes is to shift approximately \$6 million of the total pro-

posed \$60 million appropriation from larger municipalities to smaller municipalities and unincorporated communities in the unorganized borough. This shift might well be regarded as acknowledgement of, and adjustment for, the relatively higher unit costs and relative lack of economies of scale faced by smaller communities.

A second overall effect of the changes is to reduce the overall leverage ratio for municipalities from 1.82 to 1.36. Primarily, this is due to the fact that lower local match requirements result in a smaller aggregate pool of locally contributed dollars relative to the total appropriation amount of \$60 million.

I hope that this information addresses some of the concerns which you may have with SB 141 as proposed, and facilitates your deliberations regarding the disposition of the bill. Please let me know if I can be of any additional assistance. Should you have any questions, or require any additional information, please contact me at 465-3568.

Sincerely,



J. Shelby Stastny
Director

Attachments: (2)

TABLE 1

REVISED MUNICIPAL MATCHING GRANT PROGRAM

4/11/91

Local Share % = Col. C x Col. F

Total State Funds (\$000):	58,050.0	Population	Under	1,000-	5,000-	Over
Minimum State Share (\$000):	25.0	Factors:	1,000	4,999	10,000	10,000
Maximum Local Share (%):	30%	For Grant Allocation:	1.5	1.4	1.2	1.0
Minimum Local Share (%):	5%	For Local Share %:	0.1	0.3	0.7	1.0

(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(Fa)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)
Community	Population	Allocation Population Factor	Local Share % Population Factor	DCRA Assessed Full Value (\$)	Per Capita Value (\$)	Local Wealth Factor	LOCAL SHARE %	\$000	STATE SHARE %	\$000	Leverage Ratio
Akhlok	93	1.5	.1	1,758,000	18,903	0.267	5.0%	1.316	95.0%	25,000	1.05
Aklak	259	1.5	.1	8,454,191	32,642	0.460	5.0%	2.086	95.0%	39,625	1.05
Akutan	432	1.5	.1	10,816,600	25,038	0.353	5.0%	3.479	95.0%	66,092	1.05
Alakanvik	565	1.5	.1	18,442,540	32,642	0.460	5.0%	4.549	95.0%	86,440	1.05
Aleknagik	159	1.5	.1	5,190,025	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1.316	95.0%	25,000	1.05
Atoulians East Borough	69	1.5	.1	2,252,293	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1.316	95.0%	25,000	1.05
Allakaket	202	1.5	.1	6,593,616	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1.627	95.0%	30,904	1.05
Ambler	309	1.5	.1	3,469,100	11,227	0.158	5.0%	2.488	95.0%	47,274	1.05
Anaktuvuk Pass	254	1.5	.1	1,588,000	6,252	0.088	5.0%	2.045	95.0%	38,860	1.05
Anchorage, Municipality of	222,950	1.0	1.0	9,836,722,410	44,121	0.622	30.0%	9,361,283	70.0%	21,842,993	1.43
Anderson	635	1.5	.1	20,727,457	32,642	0.460	5.0%	5.113	95.0%	97,149	1.05
Angoon	685	1.5	.1	22,359,540	32,642	0.460	5.0%	5.516	95.0%	104,799	1.05
Aniak	558	1.5	.1	18,214,049	32,642	0.460	5.0%	4.493	95.0%	85,369	1.05
Anvik	89	1.5	.1	2,905,108	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1.316	95.0%	25,000	1.05
Atka	90	1.5	.1	2,937,750	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1.316	95.0%	25,000	1.05
Atkasuk	225	1.5	.1	1,925,000	8,556	0.121	5.0%	1.812	95.0%	34,423	1.05
Barrow	3,379	1.4	.3	49,341,100	14,602	0.206	6.2%	31,587	93.8%	479,775	1.07
Belhel	4,390	1.4	.3	181,960,500	41,453	0.585	17.5%	132,545	82.5%	623,324	1.21
Bellies	45	1.5	.1	1,468,875	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1.316	95.0%	25,000	1.05
Brevig Mission	197	1.5	.1	6,430,408	32,642	0.450	5.0%	1.586	95.0%	30,139	1.05
Bristol Bay Borough	1,451	1.4	.3	117,937,900	81,280	1.146	30.0%	88,296	70.0%	206,023	1.43
Buckland	302	1.5	.1	3,145,300	10,415	0.147	5.0%	2.432	95.0%	46,203	1.05
Cheformak	299	1.5	.1	9,759,858	32,642	0.460	5.0%	2.408	95.0%	45,744	1.05
Chevak	594	1.5	.1	19,389,149	32,642	0.460	5.0%	4.783	95.0%	90,877	1.05
Chignik	128	1.5	.1	8,709,200	68,041	0.959	9.6%	2,653	90.4%	25,000	1.11
Chuathbaluk	127	1.5	.1	4,145,491	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1.316	95.0%	25,000	1.05
Clark's point	87	1.5	.1	2,839,825	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1.316	95.0%	25,000	1.05
Collman cove	195	1.5	.1	6,365,125	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1.570	95.0%	29,833	1.05
Cold bay	158	1.5	.1	8,482,400	53,686	0.757	7.6%	2,047	92.4%	25,000	1.08
Cordova	2,619	1.4	.3	122,992,900	46,962	0.662	19.9%	92,186	80.1%	371,864	1.25
Craig	1,231	1.4	.3	40,178,500	32,639	0.460	13.8%	27,998	86.2%	174,786	1.16

TABLE 1

REVISED MUNICIPAL MATCHING GRANT PROGRAM

4/11/91

Local Share % = Col. C x Col. F

Total State Funds (\$000):	58,050.0	Population	Under	1,000-	5,000-	Over
Minimum State Share (\$000):	25.0	Factors:	1,000	4,999	10,000	10,000
Maximum Local Share (%):	30%	For Grant Allocation:	1.5	1.4	1.2	1.0
Minimum Local Share (%):	5%	For Local Share %:	0.1	0.3	0.7	1.0

(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(Fa)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)
Community	Population	Allocation Factor	Local Share % Population Factor	DCRA Assessed Full Value (\$)	Per Capita Value (\$)	Local Wealth Factor	LOCAL SHARE %	LOCAL SHARE \$000	STATE SHARE %	STATE SHARE \$000	Leverage Ratio
Deering	165	1.5	.1	1,867,700	11,319	0.160	5.0%	1,329	95.0%	25,243	1.05
Delta Junction	1,185	1.4	.3	27,731,800	23,402	0.330	9.9%	18,487	50.1%	168,255	1.11
Donali Borough	1,346	1.4	.3	74,435,000	55,301	0.780	23.4%	58,360	76.6%	191,115	1.31
Dillingham	2,232	1.4	.3	118,601,000	53,137	0.749	22.5%	91,890	77.5%	316,915	1.29
Diomede	184	1.5	.1	6,006,066	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1,482	95.0%	28,150	1.05
Eagle	174	1.5	.1	8,388,300	48,209	0.680	6.8%	1,942	93.2%	26,620	1.07
Eek	279	1.5	.1	9,107,024	32,642	0.460	5.0%	2,247	95.0%	42,684	1.05
Ekwok	122	1.5	.1	3,982,283	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1,316	95.0%	25,000	1.05
Elim	294	1.5	.1	9,596,649	32,642	0.460	5.0%	2,367	95.0%	44,979	1.05
Emmonak	675	1.5	.1	22,033,123	32,642	0.460	5.0%	5,435	95.0%	103,269	1.05
Fairbanks	28,251	1.0	1.0	1,071,624,900	37,932	0.535	30.0%	1,186,210	70.0%	2,767,824	1.43
Fairbanks North Star Borough	42,500	1.0	1.0	2,142,124,000	50,403	0.711	30.0%	1,784,501	70.0%	1,153,836	1.43
False Pass	69	1.5	.1	2,252,298	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1,316	95.0%	25,000	1.05
Fort Yukon	642	1.5	.1	20,955,948	32,642	0.460	5.0%	5,169	95.0%	99,220	1.05
Galena	928	1.5	.1	19,585,100	21,105	0.298	5.0%	7,472	95.0%	141,975	1.05
Gambell	520	1.5	.1	16,973,665	32,642	0.460	5.0%	4,187	95.0%	79,555	1.05
Golovin	154	1.5	.1	5,026,816	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1,316	95.0%	25,000	1.05
Goodnews Bay	230	1.5	.1	7,507,583	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1,852	95.0%	35,188	1.05
Grayling	228	1.5	.1	7,442,299	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1,836	95.0%	34,882	1.05
Haines	1,160	1.4	.3	51,001,500	43,967	0.620	18.6%	37,632	81.4%	164,705	1.23
Haines Borough	1,685	1.4	.3	52,886,700	31,387	0.443	13.3%	36,628	86.7%	239,248	1.15
Holy Cross	276	1.5	.1	9,009,099	32,642	0.460	5.0%	2,222	95.0%	42,225	1.05
Homer	4,338	1.4	.3	205,761,300	47,432	0.669	20.1%	154,607	79.9%	615,940	1.25
Hoonah	894	1.5	.1	21,586,000	24,145	0.340	5.0%	7,199	95.0%	136,774	1.05
Hooper Bay	807	1.5	.1	5,203,800	6,448	0.091	5.0%	6,498	95.0%	123,464	1.05
Houston	738	1.5	.1	33,028,500	44,754	0.631	6.3%	7,605	93.7%	112,907	1.07
Hughes	75	1.5	.1	2,440,125	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1,316	95.0%	25,000	1.05
Huslia	225	1.5	.1	7,344,374	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1,812	95.0%	34,423	1.05
Hydaburg	457	1.5	.1	9,024,100	19,746	0.278	5.0%	3,680	95.0%	69,917	1.05
Juneau, City and Borough of	29,946	1.0	1.0	1,247,450,700	41,657	0.587	30.0%	1,257,380	70.0%	2,933,888	1.43
Kachemak	418	1.5	.1	17,954,400	42,953	0.606	6.1%	4,123	93.9%	63,950	1.06

TABLE 1

REVISED MUNICIPAL MATCHING GRANT PROGRAM

4/11/91

Local Share % = Col. C x Col. F

Total State Funds (\$000):	58,050.0	Population	Under	1,000-	5,000-	Over
Minimum State Share (\$000):	25.0	Factors:	1,000	4,999	10,000	10,000
Maximum Local Share (%):	30%	For Grant Allocation:	1.5	1.4	1.2	1.0
Minimum Local Share (%):	5%	For Local Share %:	0.1	0.3	0.7	1.0

(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(Fa)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)
Community	Population	Allocation Population Factor	Local Share % Population Factor	DCRA Assessed Full Value (\$)	Per Capita Value (\$)	Local Wealth Factor	LOCAL SHARE %	STATE SHARE \$000	STATE SHARE %	STATE SHARE \$000	Leverage Ratio
Kake	678	1.5	.1	16,843,800	24,843	0.350	5.0%	5,459	95.0%	103,728	1.05
Kaktovik	224	1.5	.1	2,219,300	9,908	0.140	5.0%	1,604	95.0%	34,270	1.05
Kallag	268	1.5	.1	8,747,966	32,642	0.460	5.0%	2,158	95.0%	41,002	1.05
Kasaan	69	1.5	.1	2,252,275	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1,316	95.0%	25,000	1.05
Kenai	6,543	1.2	.7	281,331,400	42,997	0.606	30.0%	336,441	70.0%	785,028	1.43
Kenai Peninsula Borough	21,886	1.0	1.0	2,419,659,910	110,557	1.559	30.0%	918,955	70.0%	2,144,228	1.43
Kelchikan	7,730	1.2	.7	438,590,300	56,739	0.800	30.0%	397,476	70.0%	927,444	1.43
Kelchikan Gateway Borough	4,592	1.4	.3	367,375,500	80,003	1.128	30.0%	279,431	70.0%	652,005	1.43
Kiana	414	1.5	.1	5,051,900	12,203	0.172	5.0%	3,334	95.0%	63,338	1.05
King Cove	790	1.5	.1	29,189,900	36,949	0.521	5.2%	6,643	94.8%	120,863	1.05
Kivalina	298	1.5	.1	3,388,600	11,371	0.160	5.0%	2,400	95.0%	45,591	1.05
Klawock	897	1.5	.1	9,194,000	10,250	0.145	5.0%	7,223	95.0%	137,233	1.05
Kobuk	87	1.5	.1	1,102,900	12,677	0.179	5.0%	1,316	95.0%	25,000	1.05
Kodiak	6,774	1.2	.7	438,936,900	64,797	0.914	30.0%	348,319	70.0%	812,744	1.43
Kodiak Island Borough	7,716	1.2	.7	185,178,500	23,999	0.338	23.7%	287,369	76.3%	925,765	1.31
Kotlik	452	1.5	.1	14,754,032	32,642	0.460	5.0%	3,640	95.0%	69,152	1.05
Kolzebue	3,705	1.4	.3	103,226,300	27,861	0.393	11.8%	70,284	88.2%	526,062	1.13
Koyuk	224	1.5	.1	7,311,733	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1,804	95.0%	34,270	1.05
Koyukuk	138	1.5	.1	4,504,550	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1,316	95.0%	25,000	1.05
Kupreanof	52	1.5	.1	1,697,367	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1,316	95.0%	25,000	1.05
Kwethluk	541	1.5	.1	17,659,140	32,642	0.460	5.0%	4,356	95.0%	82,768	1.05
Lake and Peninsula Borough	1,198	1.4	.3	41,579,700	34,708	0.489	14.7%	29,272	85.3%	170,101	1.17
Larsen Bay	149	1.5	.1	3,268,300	21,935	0.309	5.0%	1,316	95.0%	25,000	1.05
Lower Kalskag	273	1.5	.1	8,911,174	32,642	0.460	5.0%	2,198	95.0%	41,766	1.05
Manokotak	370	1.5	.1	12,077,416	32,642	0.460	5.0%	2,979	95.0%	56,607	1.05
Marshall	294	1.5	.1	9,596,649	32,642	0.460	5.0%	2,367	95.0%	44,979	1.05
Malanuska-Susitna Borough	30,917	1.0	1.0	1,447,950,990	46,833	0.660	30.0%	1,298,151	70.0%	3,029,019	1.43
McGrath	533	1.5	.1	17,398,007	32,642	0.460	5.0%	4,292	95.0%	81,544	1.05
Mckoryuk	190	1.5	.1	6,201,916	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1,530	95.0%	29,068	1.05
Mountain Village	742	1.5	.1	24,220,115	32,642	0.460	5.0%	5,975	95.0%	113,519	1.05
Napaklak	315	1.5	.1	10,282,124	32,642	0.460	5.0%	2,536	95.0%	48,192	1.05

TABLE 1

REVISED MUNICIPAL MATCHING GRANT PROGRAM

4/11/91

Local Share % = Col. C x Col. F

Total State Funds (\$000):	58,050.0	Population	Under	1,000-	5,000-	Over
Minimum State Share (\$000):	25.0	Factors:	1,000	4,999	10,000	10,000
Maximum Local Share (%):	30%	For Grant Allocation:	1.5	1.4	1.2	1.0
Minimum Local Share (%):	5%	For Local Share %:	0.1	0.3	0.7	1.0

(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(Fa)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)
Community	Population	Allocation Population Factor	Local Share % Population Factor	DCRA Assessed Full Value (\$)	Per Capita Value (\$)	Local Wealth Factor	LOCAL SHARE %	LOCAL SHARE \$000	STATE SHARE %	STATE SHARE \$000	Leverage Ratio
Napaskiak	331	1.5	.1	10,804,391	32,642	0.460	5.0%	2.665	95.0%	50.640	1.05
Nenana	555	1.5	.1	16,186,800	29,165	0.411	5.0%	4.468	95.0%	84.910	1.05
New Stuyahok	374	1.5	.1	12,207,982	32,642	0.460	5.0%	3.012	95.0%	57.219	1.05
Newhalen	168	1.5	.1	3,602,800	21,445	0.302	5.0%	1.353	95.0%	25.702	1.05
Nikolai	113	1.5	.1	3,688,508	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1.316	95.0%	25.000	1.05
Nome	4,303	1.4	.3	137,990,000	32,068	0.452	13.6%	95.888	86.4%	610.971	1.16
Nondalton	229	1.5	.1	3,804,400	16,613	0.234	5.0%	1.844	95.0%	35.035	1.05
Noorvik	600	1.5	.1	6,457,500	10,763	0.152	5.0%	4.831	95.0%	91.794	1.05
North Pole	1,610	1.4	.3	184,583,000	114,648	1.617	30.0%	97.971	70.0%	228.599	1.43
North Slope Borough	2,285	1.4	.3	11,883,976,500	5,200,865	73.335	30.0%	139.046	70.0%	324.441	1.43
Northwest Arctic Borough	315	1.5	.1	4,110,500	13,049	0.184	5.0%	2.536	95.0%	48.192	1.05
Nuqsut	324	1.5	.1	11,996,900	37,027	0.522	5.2%	2.731	94.8%	49.569	1.06
Nulato	362	1.5	.1	11,816,282	32,642	0.460	5.0%	2.915	95.0%	55.383	1.05
Nunapitchuk	372	1.5	.1	12,142,699	32,642	0.460	5.0%	2.995	95.0%	56.913	1.05
Old Harbor	322	1.5	.1	5,787,400	17,973	0.253	5.0%	2.593	95.0%	49.263	1.05
Ouzinkie	204	1.5	.1	3,245,100	15,907	0.224	5.0%	1.643	95.0%	31.210	1.05
Palmer	2,988	1.4	.3	104,192,300	34,870	0.492	14.8%	73.409	85.2%	424.258	1.17
Pelican	251	1.5	.1	10,440,800	41,597	0.587	5.9%	2.393	94.1%	38.401	1.06
Petersburg	3,440	1.4	.3	162,441,900	47,221	0.666	20.0%	121.921	80.0%	488.436	1.25
Pilot Station	455	1.5	.1	14,851,957	32,642	0.460	5.0%	3.664	95.0%	69.611	1.05
Point Hope	610	1.5	.1	7,034,600	11,532	0.163	5.0%	4.912	95.0%	93.324	1.05
Port Alexander	119	1.5	.1	3,884,358	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1.316	95.0%	25.000	1.05
Port Heiden	121	1.5	.1	2,675,400	22,111	0.312	5.0%	1.316	95.0%	25.000	1.05
Port Lions	300	1.5	.1	6,969,600	23,232	0.328	5.0%	2.416	95.0%	45.897	1.05
Quinhagak	499	1.5	.1	16,288,190	32,642	0.460	5.0%	4.018	95.0%	76.342	1.05
Ruby	243	1.5	.1	7,931,924	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1.957	95.0%	37.177	1.05
Russian Mission	266	1.5	.1	8,682,683	32,642	0.460	5.0%	2.142	95.0%	40.696	1.05
Sand Point	993	1.5	.1	39,039,700	39,315	0.554	5.5%	8.916	94.5%	151.920	1.06
Savoonga	511	1.5	.1	16,679,890	32,642	0.460	5.0%	4.115	95.0%	78.178	1.05
Saxman	308	1.5	.1	13,305,600	43,200	0.609	6.1%	3.057	93.9%	47.121	1.06
Scammon Bay	306	1.5	.1	9,988,349	32,642	0.460	5.0%	2.464	95.0%	46.815	1.05

TABLE 1

REVISED MUNICIPAL MATCHING GRANT PROGRAM

4/11/91

Local Share % = Col. C x Col. F

Total State Funds (\$000):	58,050.0	Population Factors:	Under 1,000	1,000 - 4,999	5,000 - 10,000	Over 10,000
Minimum State Share (\$000):	25.0					
Maximum Local Share (%):	30%	For Grant Allocation:	1.5	1.4	1.2	1.0
Minimum Local Share (%):	5%	For Local Share %:	0.1	0.3	0.7	1.0

(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(Fa)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)
Community	Population	Allocation Population Factor	Local Share % Population Factor	DCRA Assessed Full Value (\$)	Per Capita Value (\$)	Local Wealth Factor	LOCAL SHARE %	LOCAL SHARE \$000	STATE SHARE %	STATE SHARE \$000	Leverage Ratio
Selawik	672	1.5	.1	7,930,700	11,802	0.166	5.0%	5.411	95.0%	102.810	1.05
Seldovia	565	1.5	.1	21,089,400	37,326	0.526	5.3%	4.802	94.7%	86.440	1.06
Seward	2,829	1.4	.3	139,627,200	49,356	0.695	20.9%	105.994	79.1%	401.692	1.26
Shageluk	152	1.5	.1	4,961,533	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1.316	95.0%	25.000	1.05
Shaktoolik	197	1.5	.1	6,430,408	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1.586	95.0%	30.139	1.05
Sheldon Point	131	1.5	.1	4,276,058	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1.316	95.0%	25.000	1.05
Shishmaref	430	1.5	.1	14,035,916	32,642	0.460	5.0%	3.462	95.0%	65.786	1.05
Shungnak	214	1.5	.1	2,963,300	13,847	0.195	5.0%	1.723	95.0%	32.740	1.05
Sitka, City and Borough of	8,257	1.2	.7	446,849,500	54,118	0.763	30.0%	424.574	70.0%	990.674	1.43
Skagway	704	1.5	.1	54,411,100	77,288	1.090	10.9%	13.173	89.1%	107.706	1.12
Soldotna	3,733	1.4	.3	200,457,100	53,699	0.757	22.7%	155.788	77.3%	530.038	1.29
St. George	188	1.5	.1	6,136,633	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1.514	95.0%	28.762	1.05
St. Mary's	491	1.5	.1	4,184,700	8,523	0.120	5.0%	3.954	95.0%	75.118	1.05
St. Michael	303	1.5	.1	9,890,424	32,642	0.460	5.0%	2.440	95.0%	46.356	1.05
St. Paul	586	1.5	.1	19,128,015	32,642	0.460	5.0%	4.719	95.0%	89.653	1.05
Stebbins	394	1.5	.1	12,860,816	32,642	0.460	5.0%	3.173	95.0%	60.278	1.05
Tanana	414	1.5	.1	11,511,900	27,807	0.392	5.0%	3.334	85.0%	63.338	1.05
Teller	237	1.5	.1	7,736,074	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1.908	95.0%	36.259	1.05
Tenakee Springs	108	1.5	.1	3,525,300	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1.316	95.0%	25.000	1.05
Thorne Bay	525	1.5	.1	17,136,874	32,642	0.460	5.0%	4.227	95.0%	80.320	1.05
Togiak	713	1.5	.1	23,273,507	32,642	0.460	5.0%	5.741	95.0%	109.082	1.05
Toksook Bay	446	1.5	.1	14,558,182	32,642	0.460	5.0%	3.591	95.0%	68.234	1.05
Tuluksak	357	1.5	.1	11,653,074	32,642	0.460	5.0%	2.875	95.0%	54.618	1.05
Unalakleet	740	1.5	.1	24,154,832	32,642	0.460	5.0%	5.959	95.0%	113.213	1.05
Unalaska	2,265	1.4	.3	116,125,240	51,269	0.723	21.7%	89.064	78.3%	321.601	1.28
Upper Kalskag	149	1.5	.1	4,863,608	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1.316	95.0%	25.000	1.05
Valdez	7,193	1.2	.7	1,370,370,900	190,515	2.686	30.0%	369.864	70.0%	863.015	1.43
Wainwright	512	1.5	.1	3,692,900	7,213	0.102	5.0%	4.123	95.0%	78.331	1.05
Wales	161	1.5	.1	5,255,308	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1.316	95.0%	25.000	1.05
Wasilla	3,342	1.4	.3	228,384,700	68,338	0.964	28.9%	192.953	71.1%	474.521	1.41
White Mountain	180	1.5	.1	5,075,500	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1.449	95.0%	27.538	1.05

TABLE 1

REVISED MUNICIPAL MATCHING GRANT PROGRAM

4/11/91

Local Share % = Col. C x Col. F

Total State Funds (\$000): 58,050.0
 Minimum State Share (\$000): 25.0
 Maximum Local Share (%): 30%
 Minimum Local Share (%): 5%

Population Factors:	Under 1,000	1,000-4,999	5,000-10,000	Over 10,000
For Grant Allocation:	1.5	1.4	1.2	1.0
For Local Share %:	0.1	0.3	0.7	1.0

(A) Community	(B) Population	(C) Allocation Factor	(D) Local Share % Population Factor	(E) DCRA Assessed Full Value (\$)	(F) Per Capita Value (\$)	(Fa) Local Wealth Factor	(H) LOCAL SHARE %	(I) \$000	(J) STATE SHARE %	(K) \$000	(L) Leverage Ratio
Whittier	299	1.5	.1	18,115,600	61,591	0.868	8.7%	4.351	91.3%	45.744	1.10
Wrangell	2,130	1.4	.3	110,198,000	41,900	0.591	17.7%	80.447	82.3%	373.426	1.22
Yakutat	527	1.5	.1	19,792,100	37,556	0.530	5.3%	4.508	94.7%	80.626	1.06
TOTAL:	158	527,553.		\$37,413,729,446			26%	20,646.602	74%	58,050.000	1.36

STATEWIDE AVERAGE:

\$70,919 1.000

TABLE 1

REVISED MUNICIPAL MATCHING GRANT PROGRAM

4/11/91

Local Share % = Col. C x Col. F

Total State Funds (\$000):	58,050.0	<i>Population</i>	<i>Under</i>	1,000-	5,000-	<i>Over</i>
Minimum State Share (\$000):	25.0	<i>Factors:</i>	1,000	4,999	10,000	10,000
Maximum Local Share (%):	30%	<i>For Grant Allocation:</i>	1.5	1.4	1.2	1.0
Minimum Local Share (%):	5%	<i>For Local Share %:</i>	0.1	0.3	0.7	1.0

(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(Fa)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)
Community	Population	Allocation Population Factor	Local Share % Population Factor	DCRA Assessed Full Value (\$)	Per Capita Value (\$)	Local Wealth Factor	LOCAL SHARE %	STATE SHARE %	STATE SHARE \$000	LEVERAGE RATIO	

NOTES:

Col. A - Excludes unincorporated communities outside boroughs, Metlakatla, and seven incorporated communities of uncertain dissolution status (Aklachak, Atmautluak, Kasigluk, Newtok, Nightmute, Platinum and Tununak).

Col. B - Population figures shown are those used by DCRA for the FY 91 State revenue sharing program.

Col. E - Taxable property full and true value, including oil and gas property, as established by DCRA (State Assessor).

Communities showing a per capita value of \$32,642 are communities with population less than 750 people whose full value (Col. D) has not been assessed. DCRA establishes full values for these communities by calculating a weighted average per capita full valuation for all communities of less than 750 population for which assessments have been made, and multiplying that per capita full value by the populations of the former set of unassessed communities to produce full values for them. Generally, but not exclusively, these unassessed communities lie within the Unorganized Borough, while the set of assessed communities of population less than 750 lies within organized boroughs.

Col. F -

Col. G - Equals local per capita value (Col. E) divided by the statewide average per capita value (bottom of Col. E).

Equals product of population factor (Col. C) and local wealth factor (Col. F). The minimum and maximum local shares (percentages) of project cost are

Col. I - shown with the assumptions above the table.

Col. J - Equals 1 minus the local share (Col. G).

Col. K - Equals pro rata share of Total State Funds, based on local population, net of instances where the Minimum State Share (shown above table) is applied.

Col. L - Equals 1 divided by the state share percentage (Col. I).

Source: OMB/JF

File: CAPITAL3.XLS

TABLE 2
REVISED MINIMUM GRANT
FOR UNORGANIZED COMMUNITIES

Minimum State Share (\$000):		25,000		
	Election District	State Share	Local Share	Local Match %
Hydor	1	\$25,000	\$1,316	5.0%
Myers Chuck	1	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Edna Bay	2	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Gustavus	2	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Hollis	2	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Klukwan	2	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Point Baker	2	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Port Protection	2	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Whale Pass	2	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Ellin Cove	3	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Chenega	6	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Chitina	6	25,000	1,316	5.0%
McCarthy	6	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Talitlek	6	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Chicken	17	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Chistochina	17	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Copper Center	17	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Deltana	17	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Dot Lake	17	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Dot Lake Services	17	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Dry Creek	17	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Eagle Village	17	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Four Mile Road Community	17	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Gakona	17	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Glenallen	17	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Gulkana	17	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Healy Lake	17	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Konny Lake	17	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Mendeltna	17	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Mentasta	17	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Northway	17	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Panguingue Creek	17	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Paxson	17	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Slana	17	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Tanacross	17	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Tazlina	17	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Tellin	17	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Tok	17	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Tolsona	17	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Tonsina	17	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Central	18	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Circle	18	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Livengood	19	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Chuloonawik	23	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Council	23	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Hamilton	23	25,000	1,316	5.0%
King Island	23	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Solomon	23	25,000	1,316	5.0%

	<u>Election District</u>	<u>State Share</u>	<u>Local Share</u>	<u>Local Match %</u>
Arctic Village	24	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Beaver	24	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Birch Creek	24	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Chalkyitsik	24	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Crooked Creek	24	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Evansville	24	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Limo Village	24	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Manley Hot Springs	24	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Minchumina	24	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Minto	24	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Pitka's Point	24	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Rampart	24	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Rod Divil	24	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Sleetmute	24	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Stovons Village	24	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Stony River	24	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Takotna	24	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Telida	24	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Venetie	24	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Wiseman	24	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Kipnuk	25	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Kongiganak	25	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Kwigillingok	25	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Oscarville	25	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Tuntutuliak	25	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Ekuk	26	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Koliganek	26	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Nikolski	26	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Portago Creek	26	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Twin Hills	26	25,000	1,316	5.0%
Total:		\$1,950,000	\$102,632	

Office of the Governor, Office of Management and Budget

SENATE COMMITTEE REPORT
FIRST COMMITTEE OF REFERRAL

DATE: 2/25/91

FURTHER: Finance

Date of 5-Day Notice: 3/7/91
(in accordance with Uniform Rule 23)

DATE TURNED INTO OFFICE: 4-24-91

C&RA Committee considered SB 141

Establishing a capital project matching grant program for municipalities and unincorporated communities; authorizing the adoption of regulations; efd.

and recommended:

- replace with _____ cs SB 141 (CRA) same title new title
- attached amendment(s)
- _____ letter of intent adopted
- do pass
- do not pass
- no recommendation
- individual recommendations
- further referral to _____

ATTACHES NEW FISCAL NOTE(S):

Department(s)/Date:

Department(s)/Date:

- fiscal note(s) ~~_____~~ zero fiscal note(s)

appropriation-no fiscal note

Governor's bill w/fiscal notes for C

SIGNING DO PASS:

OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS:

William J. ... No Rec
Laura ... No Rec

Chair Signature and Recommendation
No Pass

STEVE FRANK
DISTRICT K
SEAT A

119 N. Cushman, Rm. 213
Fairbanks, Alaska 99701

While in Juneau
P.O. Box A
Juneau, Alaska 99811
(907) 465-3709
Capitol Rm. 514

Alaska State Legislature



Senate

MEMBER
Finance Committee
Resources Committee
Legislative Council
Special Committee on Banking &
Economic Development

VICE-CHAIR
Community & Regional
Affairs Committee

Memorandum

TO: Senate Secretary

FROM: *M* Senator Steve Frank, Chairman
Community & Regional Affairs

RE: Committee Meeting Schedule

DATE: April 18, 1991

Tuesday April 23. 3:30 p.m. - Butrovich Room:

SCR 23 - Supporting Yakutat Borough Incorporation
Bring up CSSB 141 (CPT)

Thursday April 25. 3:30 p.m. - Butrovich Room:

SB 231 - Conveyance of Land: Chugach State Park



Alaska State Legislature


SENATE

Official Business

P.O. Box V
State Capitol
Juneau, Alaska 99811

MEMORANDUM

TO: Senate C&RA Committee Members

FROM:  Senator Steve Frank, Chairman
Senate C&RA Committee

RE: Committee Substitute for SB 141 - Matching Grants For
Capital Projects

DATE: April 23, 1991

Attached is a Committee Substitute for SB 141 that we have altered in the following fashion:

We focused on the concerns expressed by many local governments that the match was too large and that is more expensive to build in rural Alaska.

- 1) Decreased the maximum municipal match to 30% and the minimum municipal match to 5%;

This was done to make the match something more achievable for the communities while still requiring their financial participation. However, two years from the date the act becomes effective the match would go to the Governor's proposed 50/50 and 90/10.

- 2) Increased the minimum grant for unincorporated communities to \$25,000.

Bringing the unincorporated communities up to this level would put them in parity with the incorporated ones.

- 3) Changed the method for allocating the total dollar amount available by applying a weighting factor inversely proportional to the community size.

The factors used correspond to the population groups which OMB employed to allocate capital dollars in the original bill and would give those communities under 1,000 a factor of 1.5, between 1,000 and 5,000 the factor is 1.4, 5,000 to 10,000 the factor is 1.2 and over 10,000 the factor is 1. The intent was to recognize the higher cost of construction in smaller communities.

7-GS0073G
Cook
4/23/91

CS FOR SENATE BILL NO. 141 (CRA)

IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

SEVENTEENTH LEGISLATURE - FIRST SESSION

BY THE SENATE COMMUNITY AND REGIONAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Offered:

Referred:

Sponsor(s): SENATE RULES/GOVERNOR

A BILL

FOR AN ACT ENTITLED

1 "An Act establishing a capital project matching grant program for municipalities and a
2 capital project matching grant program for unincorporated communities; relating to the
3 adoption of regulations involving the administration of certain grants; and providing for
4 an effective date."

5 BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:

6 * Section 1. AS 37.05.318 is amended to read:

7 Sec. 37.05.318. [FURTHER] REGULATIONS. The Department of Administration
8 under [PROHIBITED. NOTWITHSTANDING] the Administrative Procedure Act (AS 44.62)
9 [, THE FISCAL PROCEDURES ACT (AS 37.05), AND THE EXECUTIVE BUDGET ACT
10 (AS 37.07), A STATE AGENCY] may [NOT] adopt regulations that [OR] impose additional
11 requirements or procedures to implement, interpret, ~~make~~ specific, or otherwise carry out the
12 provisions of AS 37.05.315 - 37.05.317, including provisions for mandatory audits and
13 reports. Regulations adopted under this section shall comply with this chapter, AS 37.07
14 (Executive Budget Act), and requirements of [UNLESS REQUIRED BY] the federal

1 government for participation in federal programs.

2 * Sec. 2. AS 37.05 is amended by adding a new section to read:

3 Sec. 37.05.322. MUNICIPAL CAPITAL PROJECT MATCHING GRANT PROGRAM.

4 (a) The municipal capital project matching grant fund is established in the Department of
5 Administration consisting of appropriations to the fund. Appropriations do not lapse except as
6 provided under (f) of this section. Interest earned on money in the fund shall be deposited by
7 the department into the general fund. Appropriations shall be allocated by the department each
8 fiscal year to individual grant accounts within the fund for each municipality. The amount
9 allocated to a grant account is determined by multiplying the total amount appropriated to the
10 fund during a fiscal year by a fraction,

11 (1) the numerator of which equals

12 (A) for a municipality with a population under 1,000, the amount equal
13 to that population multiplied by 1.5;

14 (B) for a municipality with a population of at least 1,000 but less than
15 5,000, the amount equal to that population multiplied by 1.4;

16 (C) for a municipality with population of at least 5,000 but not greater
17 than 10,000, the amount equal to that population multiplied by 1.2; or

18 (D) for a municipality with a population of over 10,000, the amount equal
19 to that population; and

20 (2) the denominator of which equals the sum of the numerators calculated for all
21 municipalities under (1)(A) - (D) of this subsection.

22 (b) The minimum amount allocated to the grant account of a municipality each fiscal
23 year under (a) of this section equals \$25,000. The department shall reduce allocations under (a)
24 of this section on a pro rata basis based upon the population of the municipalities if necessary
25 to fund the minimum amount for each municipality. If appropriations are not sufficient to fully
26 fund minimum amounts, the amount available shall be equally allocated to each municipality.

27 (c) Subject to (d) and (e) of this section, each municipality may draw amounts from its
28 grant account within the municipal project matching grant fund for planning, design, and
29 construction of capital projects or capital improvements, as defined in AS 37.07.120. In
30 accepting a draw, the municipality covenants with the state that it will operate and maintain the
31 capital improvement for which the draw is used for the practical life of the capital improvement,

1 and that the municipality will not rely on the state to operate or maintain the capital improvement
2 or pay for its operation or maintenance. This requirement does not apply to use of money from
3 a draw for repair or improvement of an existing facility that is operated or maintained by the
4 state at the time that the draw is made if the repair or improvement for which the draw is used
5 will not substantially increase the operating or maintenance costs to the state. The municipality,
6 its agents, contractors, and subcontractors shall comply with the hiring preferences under
7 AS 36.10 in hiring employees to be paid wholly or in part with money from a draw.

8 (d) The municipality shall contribute a local share to be used on each capital project or
9 improvement for which a draw is made. The amount of the local share equals the local share
10 factor multiplied by the amount of the draw. For purposes of this subsection, the

11 (1) local share factor equals the local share percentage divided by the state share
12 percentage, except that

13 (A) if the product of the population factor and the local wealth factor is
14 greater than or equal to 1.0, the local share factor equals 3/7th; or

15 (B) if the local wealth factor is 0, the local share factor equals 5/95th;

16 (2) local share percentage equals the population factor multiplied by the local
17 wealth factor;

18 (3) state share percentage equals one minus the local share percentage;

19 (4) population factor equals

20 (A) 0.1 if the population of the municipality is less than 1,000;

21 (B) 0.3 if the population of the municipality is at least 1,000 but less than
22 5,000;

23 (C) 0.7 if the population of the municipality is at least 5,000 but not more
24 than 10,000; or

25 (D) 1.0 if the population of the municipality is more than 10,000;

26 (5) local wealth factor equals the amount obtained by dividing the per capita
27 taxable real and personal property valuation of the municipality by the statewide average per
28 capita taxable real and personal property valuation of all municipalities in the state.

29 (e) The amount of the local share calculated under (d) of this section shall be adjusted
30 if necessary so that it does not exceed 30 percent of the amount of the project for which the draw
31 is used and is not less than five percent of the amount of the project. The local share may be

1 satisfied with federal or municipal funds, locally contributed labor, materials or equipment the
2 value of which shall be determined by the department, or money from another nonstate source.
3 The local share may not be satisfied with money from appropriations, allocations, entitlements,
4 grants, or other payments from the state.

5 (f) A municipality shall repay to the department money drawn from a grant account if
6 substantial, ongoing work on the project or improvement is not started within five years after the
7 effective date of the appropriation from which the draw is funded. Money repaid shall be
8 deposited into the general fund. Money from an allocation to a grant account that has not been
9 drawn out by the municipality within five years after the effective date of the appropriation from
10 which the allocation is funded lapses into the general fund.

11 (g) The department under the Administrative Procedure Act (AS 44.62) may adopt
12 regulations that impose additional requirements or procedures to implement, interpret, make
13 specific, or otherwise carry out the provisions of this section. The department shall adopt
14 regulations providing for periodic audits of the use of grant money under this section. The audits
15 must include a review of the department's determination of the value of locally contributed labor
16 under (e) of this section and a review of the adequacy of the department's verification of the
17 actual use of locally contributed labor on a project. Regulations adopted under this subsection
18 shall comply with this chapter, AS 37.07 (Executive Budget Act), and requirements of the federal
19 government for participation in federal programs.

20 (h) For purposes of this section, the population of a borough shall exclude the population
21 of each city in the borough and the per capita taxable real and personal property valuation of a
22 borough shall exclude the property valuation of each city in the borough. The determination of
23 population and per capita taxable real and personal property valuation for a municipality shall
24 be based upon data used by the Department of Community and Regional Affairs under
25 AS 14.17.140, AS 29.45.110, and AS 29.60.140 - 29.60.150.

26 (i) In this section,

27 (1) "appropriation" has the meaning given in AS 37.07.120;

28 (2) "department" means the Department of Administration.

29 * Sec. 3. AS 37.05.322(e) is repealed and reenacted to read:

30 (e) The amount of the local share calculated under (d) of this section shall be adjusted
31 if necessary so that it does not exceed 50 percent of the amount of the project for which the draw

1 is used and is not less than 10 percent of the amount of the project. The local share may be
2 satisfied with federal or municipal funds, locally contributed labor, materials or equipment the
3 value of which shall be determined by the department, or money from another nonstate source.
4 The local share may not be satisfied with money from appropriations, allocations, entitlements,
5 grants, or other payments from the state.

6 * Sec. 4. AS 44.47 is amended by adding a new section to article 3 to read:

7 Sec. 44.47.195. UNINCORPORATED COMMUNITY CAPITAL PROJECT MATCHING
8 GRANT PROGRAM. (a) The unincorporated community capital project matching grant fund
9 is established in the department consisting of appropriations to the fund. Appropriations do not
10 lapse except as provided under (f) of this section. Interest earned on money in the fund shall be
11 deposited by the department into the general fund. Appropriations shall be allocated by the
12 department each fiscal year to individual grant accounts within the fund for each unincorporated
13 community that is entitled to receive state aid under AS 29.60.140 during that fiscal year. The
14 amount allocated to a grant account is determined by dividing the total amount appropriated to
15 the fund during a fiscal year by the number of communities eligible for allocations during that
16 fiscal year.

17 (b) By February 1, the department shall determine the amount of appropriations needed
18 to provide an allocation of \$25,000 under (a) of this section for each unincorporated community
19 for the next fiscal year. The department shall request the legislature for an appropriation to the
20 unincorporated community capital project matching grant fund of at least that amount.

21 (c) Subject to (d) and (e) of this section, an incorporated nonprofit entity or a
22 Native village council may on behalf of each unincorporated community draw amounts from that
23 community's grant account within the unincorporated community capital project matching grant
24 fund for planning, design, and construction of capital projects or capital improvements, as defined
25 in AS 37.07.120. In accepting a draw, the incorporated entity or council covenants with the state
26 that it will operate and maintain the capital improvement for which the draw is used for the
27 practical life of the capital improvement, and that the incorporated entity or council will not rely
28 on the state to operate or maintain the capital improvement or pay for its operation or
29 maintenance. This requirement does not apply to use of money from a draw for repair or
30 improvement of an existing facility that is operated or maintained by the state at the time that
31 the money is made if the repair or improvement for which the draw is used will not substantially

1 increase the operating or maintenance costs to the state. The incorporated entity or council, its
2 agents, contractors, and subcontractors shall comply with the hiring preferences under AS 36.10
3 in hiring employees to be paid wholly or in part with money from a draw.

4 (d) The department, with advice from the Department of Law, shall determine whether
5 there is in each unincorporated community an incorporated nonprofit entity or a Native village
6 council that will agree to receive and spend money allocated to the community under (a) of this
7 section. If there is more than one qualified entity in the community, the department shall
8 authorize the entity that the department finds most qualified to make draws from the allocation
9 and spend the money. The department may not pay the money to a Native village council unless
10 the council waives immunity from suit for claims arising out of activities of the council related
11 to the draw. A waiver of immunity from suit under this subsection must be on a form provided
12 by the Department of Law. If there is no qualified incorporated nonprofit entity or Native village
13 council in an unincorporated community that is willing to receive money from an allocation
14 under (a) of this section, draws may not be made from the allocation for that unincorporated
15 community and the amount allocated lapses into the general fund. Neither this subsection nor
16 any action taken under it enlarges or diminishes the governmental authority or jurisdiction of a
17 Native village council.

18 (e) The incorporated nonprofit entity or Native village council shall contribute a local
19 share to be used on each capital project or improvement for which a draw is made. The local
20 share equals 5 percent of the amount of the project for which the draw is used. The local share
21 may be satisfied from federal or local money, locally contributed labor, materials or equipment
22 the value of which shall be determined by the department, or money from another nonstate
23 source. The local share may not be satisfied with money from appropriations, allocations,
24 entitlements, grants, or other payments from the state.

25 (f) An incorporated nonprofit entity or a Native village council shall repay to the
26 department money drawn from a grant account if substantial, ongoing work on the project or
27 improvement is not started within five years after the effective date of the appropriation from
28 which the draw is funded. Money repaid shall be deposited into the general fund. Money from
29 an allocation to a grant account that has not been drawn out by an incorporated nonprofit entity
30 or Native village council within five years after the effective date of the appropriation from
31 which the allocation is funded lapses into the general fund.

1 (g) The department under the Administrative Procedure Act (AS 44.62) may adopt
2 regulations that impose additional requirements or procedures to implement, interpret, make
3 specific, or otherwise carry out the provisions of this section. The department shall adopt
4 regulations providing for periodic audits of the use of grant money under this section. The audits
5 must include a review of the department's determination of the value of locally contributed labor
6 under (e) of this section and a review of the adequacy of the department's verification of the
7 actual use of locally contributed labor on a project. Regulations adopted under this subsection
8 shall comply with AS 37.05 (Fiscal Procedures Act), AS 37.07 (Executive Budget Act), and
9 requirements of the federal government for participation in federal programs.

10 (h) The limitations of AS 44.47.140 do not apply to grants made under this section.

11 * Sec. 5. AS 44.47.195(e) is repealed and reenacted to read:

12 (e) The incorporated nonprofit entity or Native village council shall contribute a local
13 share to be used on each capital project or improvement for which a draw is made. The local
14 share equals 10 percent of the amount of the project for which the draw is used. The local share
15 may be satisfied from federal or local money, locally contributed labor, materials or equipment
16 the value of which shall be determined by the department, or money from another nonstate
17 source. The local share may not be satisfied with money from appropriations, allocations,
18 entitlements, grants, or other payments from the state.

19 * Sec. 6. Sections 1, 2, and 4 of this Act take effect immediately under AS 01.10.070(c).

20 * Sec. 7. Sections 3 and 5 of this Act take effect two years after the date sections 1, 2, and 4 of this
21 Act take effect.

Mary Pease MOA 20% more realistic

Terry HOFFERLE Dillingham

- ① unincorp should get same
- ② NO Economies of scale
- ③ County contribution,
look at DCPS formulas
- ④

JOE MCGILL (5-prints)

DAVE SOWINK 1 ^{City of Palmer} 5-prints

Dorothy GORBE, ?
some munis lack powers

EVELYN Bunch - Glen Allan

ROSS DUNFEE M.O.A. (arch.)

WALT JOHNSON FIBKS NORTH STAR Brough Assembly

March 24

SB 141

- ① Should we have more categories so that the breaks would be less severe
- ② What is the hiring preference in A.S. 36.10
- ③ While there is a recognition of 50% to pay there doesn't seem to be any recognition of economies or scale in building public facilities.
- ④ What about NON PROFIT AGENCIES ~~and~~ within ORGANIZED MUNICIPALITIES

Anch HAS 42% OF POPULATION

" HAS 42% OF STATE REVENUE

- ⑤ How DOES IT FIT WITH OVERALL ANCHORAGE BUDGET

- unincorp. ~~we~~ should receive same allocation
min. entitlements as incorporated com.

- Dillingham supports SB 141 - Tol McBill

- Palmer supports

- No

Mayor Jones

(1) Can in-kind volunteer efforts be included

(2) Can city/Borough w/ no real powers do this

Glenallen - Evelyn Bunch - unincorp. community

Aless

→ what is happening w/ munic. financing

- are they reaching debt limits?

- do they have tax base

- does this replace other existing programs

p.p. schools funding, Village Safe
Water

- what does this bill do to form boroughs?

Zharoff

- base amount 25K or 50K

that all communities get regardless

of size w/ population funding
in addition

Hothorn

- cost of construction

- basic infrastructure that's needed

TABLE 1

REVISED MUNICIPAL MATCHING GRANT PROGRAM

Local Share % = Col. D x Col. Fa

Total State Funds (\$000): 58,050.0
 Minimum State Share (\$000): 25.0
 Maximum Local Share (%): 30%
 Minimum Local Share (%): 5%

Population Factors:	Under 1,000	1,000-4,099	5,000-10,000	Over 10,000
For Grant Allocation:	1.5	1.4	1.2	1.0
For Local Share %:	0.1	0.3	0.7	1.0

(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(Fa)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)
Community	Population	Allocation Population Factor	Local Share % Population Factor	DCRA Assessed Full Value (\$)	Per Capita Value (\$)	Local Wealth Factor	LOCAL SHARE %	LOCAL SHARE \$000	STATE SHARE %	STATE SHARE \$000	Leverage Ratio
Akhiok	93	1.5	.1	1,758,000	18,903	0.267	5.0%	1.316	95.0%	25,000	1.05
Aklak	259	1.5	.1	8,454,191	32,642	0.460	5.0%	2.029	95.0%	38,542	1.05
Akutan	432	1.5	.1	10,816,600	25,038	0.353	5.0%	3.384	95.0%	64,287	1.05
Alakanuk	565	1.5	.1	18,442,540	32,642	0.460	5.0%	4.425	95.0%	84,079	1.05
Aleknagik	159	1.5	.1	5,190,025	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1.316	95.0%	25,000	1.05
Atoufians East Borough	69	1.5	.1	2,252,298	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1.316	95.0%	25,000	1.05
Atlakaket	202	1.5	.1	6,593,616	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1.582	95.0%	30,060	1.05
Ambler	309	1.5	.1	3,469,100	11,227	0.158	5.0%	2.420	95.0%	45,983	1.05
Anaktuvuk Pass	254	1.5	.1	1,588,000	6,252	0.088	5.0%	1.989	95.0%	37,798	1.05
Anchorage, Municipality of	222,950	1.0	1.0	9,836,722,410	44,121	0.622	30.0%	9,465,637	70.0%	22,086,486	1.43
Anderson	635	1.5	.1	20,727,457	32,642	0.460	5.0%	4.973	95.0%	94,496	1.05
Angoon	685	1.5	.1	22,359,540	32,642	0.460	5.0%	5.365	95.0%	101,936	1.05
Aniak	558	1.5	.1	18,214,049	32,642	0.460	5.0%	4.370	95.0%	83,037	1.05
Anvik	89	1.5	.1	2,905,108	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1.316	95.0%	25,000	1.05
Atka	90	1.5	.1	2,937,750	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1.316	95.0%	25,000	1.05
Atkasuk	225	1.5	.1	1,925,000	8,556	0.121	5.0%	1.762	95.0%	33,483	1.05
Barrow	3,379	1.4	.3	49,341,100	14,602	0.206	6.2%	30.892	93.8%	469,217	1.07
Bethel	4,390	1.4	.3	181,980,500	41,453	0.585	17.5%	129,628	82.5%	609,607	1.21
Bettles	45	1.5	.1	1,468,875	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1.316	95.0%	25,000	1.05
Brevig Mission	197	1.5	.1	6,430,408	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1.543	95.0%	29,316	1.05
Bristol Bay Borough	1,451	1.4	.3	117,937,900	81,280	1.146	30.0%	86,353	70.0%	201,490	1.43
Buckland	302	1.5	.1	3,145,300	10,415	0.147	5.0%	2.365	95.0%	44,941	1.05
Chevak	299	1.5	.1	9,759,858	32,642	0.460	5.0%	2.342	95.0%	44,495	1.05
Chevak	594	1.5	.1	19,389,149	32,642	0.460	5.0%	4.652	95.0%	88,394	1.05
Chignik	128	1.5	.1	8,709,200	68,041	0.959	9.6%	2.653	90.4%	25,000	1.11
Chuathbaluk	127	1.5	.1	4,145,491	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1.316	95.0%	25,000	1.05
Clark's point	87	1.5	.1	2,839,825	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1.316	95.0%	25,000	1.05
Coffman cove	195	1.5	.1	6,365,125	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1.527	95.0%	29,018	1.05
Cold bay	158	1.5	.1	8,482,400	53,686	0.757	7.6%	2.047	92.4%	25,000	1.08
Cordova	2,619	1.4	.3	122,992,900	46,962	0.662	19.9%	90,158	80.1%	363,681	1.25
Craig	1,231	1.4	.3	40,178,500	32,639	0.460	13.8%	27,382	86.2%	170,940	1.16

TABLE 1

REVISED MUNICIPAL MATCHING GRANT PROGRAM

Local Share % = Col. D x Col. Fa

Total State Funds (\$000): 58,050.0
 Minimum State Share (\$000): 25.0
 Maximum Local Share (%): 30%
 Minimum Local Share (%): 5%

Population Factors:	Under 1,000	1,000-4,999	5,000-10,000	Over 10,000
For Grant Allocation:	1.5	1.4	1.2	1.0
For Local Share %:	0.1	0.3	0.7	1.0

(A) Community	(B) Population	(C) Allocation Population Factor	(D) Local Share % Population Factor	(E) DCRA Assessed Full Value (\$)	(F) Per Capita Value (\$)	(Fa) Local Wealth Factor	(H) LOCAL SHARE %	(I) LOCAL SHARE \$000	(J) STATE SHARE %	(K) STATE SHARE \$000	(L) Leverage Ratio
Doering	165	1.5	.1	1,867,700	11,319	0.160	5.0%	1,316	95.0%	25,000	1.05
Delta Junction	1,185	1.4	.3	27,731,800	23,402	0.330	9.9%	18,080	90.1%	164,552	1.11
Donaik Borough	1,346	1.4	.3	74,435,000	55,301	0.780	23.4%	57,076	76.6%	186,909	1.31
Dillingham	2,232	1.4	.3	118,601,000	53,137	0.749	22.5%	89,868	77.5%	309,942	1.29
Diomede	184	1.5	.1	6,006,066	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1,441	95.0%	27,381	1.05
Eagle	174	1.5	.1	8,388,300	48,209	0.680	6.8%	1,889	93.2%	25,893	1.07
Eek	279	1.5	.1	9,107,024	32,642	0.460	5.0%	2,185	95.0%	41,519	1.05
Ekwok	122	1.5	.1	3,982,283	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1,316	95.0%	25,000	1.05
Elim	294	1.5	.1	9,596,649	32,642	0.460	5.0%	2,303	95.0%	43,751	1.05
Emmonak	675	1.5	.1	22,033,123	32,642	0.460	5.0%	5,287	95.0%	100,448	1.05
Fairbanks	28,251	1.0	1.0	1,071,624,900	37,932	0.535	30.0%	1,199,434	70.0%	2,798,678	1.43
Fairbanks North Star Borough	42,500	1.0	1.0	2,142,124,000	50,403	0.711	30.0%	1,804,394	70.0%	4,210,252	1.43
False Pass	69	1.5	.1	2,252,298	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1,316	95.0%	25,000	1.05
Fort Yukon	642	1.5	.1	20,955,948	32,642	0.460	5.0%	5,028	95.0%	95,537	1.05
Galena	928	1.5	.1	19,585,100	21,105	0.298	5.0%	7,268	95.0%	138,098	1.05
Gambell	520	1.5	.1	16,973,665	32,642	0.460	5.0%	4,073	95.0%	77,382	1.05
Golovin	154	1.5	.1	5,026,816	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1,316	95.0%	25,000	1.05
Goodnews Bay	230	1.5	.1	7,507,583	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1,801	95.0%	34,227	1.05
Grayling	228	1.5	.1	7,442,299	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1,786	95.0%	33,929	1.05
Haines	1,160	1.4	.3	51,001,500	43,967	0.620	18.6%	36,804	81.4%	161,081	1.23
Haines Borough	1,685	1.4	.3	52,886,700	31,387	0.443	13.3%	35,822	86.7%	233,984	1.15
Holy Cross	276	1.5	.1	9,009,099	32,642	0.460	5.0%	2,162	95.0%	41,072	1.05
Homer	4,338	1.4	.3	205,761,300	47,432	0.669	20.1%	151,205	71.9%	602,385	1.25
Hoonah	894	1.5	.1	21,586,000	24,145	0.340	5.0%	7,002	95.0%	133,038	1.05
Hooper Bay	807	1.5	.1	5,203,800	6,448	0.091	5.0%	6,321	95.0%	120,091	1.05
Houston	738	1.5	.1	33,028,500	44,754	0.631	6.3%	7,397	91.7%	109,823	1.07
Hughes	75	1.5	.1	2,448,125	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1,316	95.0%	25,000	1.05
Huslia	225	1.5	.1	7,344,374	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1,762	95.0%	33,483	1.05
Hydaburg	457	1.5	.1	9,024,100	19,746	0.278	5.0%	3,579	95.0%	68,007	1.05
Juneau, City and Borough of	29,946	1.0	1.0	1,247,450,700	41,657	0.587	30.0%	1,271,397	70.0%	2,966,593	1.43
Kachemak	418	1.5	.1	17,954,400	42,953	0.606	6.1%	4,010	93.9%	62,203	1.06

TABLE 1

REVISED MUNICIPAL MATCHING GRANT PROGRAM

Local Share % = Col. D x Col. Fa

Total State Funds (\$000):	58,050.0
Minimum State Share (\$000):	25.0
Maximum Local Share (%):	30%
Minimum Local Share (%):	5%

Population	Under	1,000-	5,000-	Over
Factors:	1,000	4,999	10,000	10,000
For Grant Allocation:	1.5	1.4	1.2	1.0
For Local Share %:	0.1	0.3	0.7	1.0

(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(Fa)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)
Community	Population	Allocation Population Factor	Local Share % Population Factor	DCRA Assessed Full Value (\$)	Per Capita Value (\$)	Local Wealth Factor	LOCAL SHARE %	LOCAL SHARE \$000	STATE SHARE %	STATE SHARE \$000	Leverage Ratio
Kake	678	1.5	.1	16,843,800	24,843	0.350	5.0%	5.310	95.0%	100.895	1.05
Kaktovik	224	1.5	.1	2,219,300	9,908	0.140	5.0%	1.754	95.0%	33.334	1.05
Kaltag	268	1.5	.1	8,747,966	32,642	0.460	5.0%	2.099	95.0%	39.882	1.05
Kasaan	69	1.5	.1	2,252,275	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1.316	95.0%	25.000	1.05
Kenai	6,543	1.2	.7	281,331,400	42,997	0.606	30.0%	333.591	70.0%	778.380	1.43
Kenai Peninsula Borough	21,886	1.0	1.0	2,419,659,910	110,557	1.559	30.0%	929.199	70.0%	2,168.131	1.43
Ketchikan	7,730	1.2	.7	438,590,300	56,739	0.800	30.0%	394.110	70.0%	919.590	1.43
Ketchikan Gateway Borough	4,592	1.4	.3	367,375,500	80,003	1.128	30.0%	273.282	70.0%	637.658	1.43
Kiana	414	1.5	.1	5,051,900	12,203	0.172	5.0%	3.243	95.0%	61.608	1.05
King Cove	790	1.5	.1	29,189,900	36,949	0.521	5.2%	6.462	94.8%	117.562	1.05
Kivalina	298	1.5	.1	3,388,600	11,371	0.160	5.0%	2.334	95.0%	44.346	1.05
Klawock	897	1.5	.1	9,194,000	10,250	0.145	5.0%	7.026	95.0%	133.485	1.05
Kobuk	87	1.5	.1	1,102,900	12,677	0.179	5.0%	1.316	95.0%	25.000	1.05
Kodiak	6,774	1.2	.7	438,936,900	64,797	0.914	30.0%	345.369	70.0%	805.860	1.43
Kodiak Island Borough	7,716	1.2	.7	185,178,500	23,999	0.338	23.7%	284.935	76.3%	917.924	1.31
Kolliq	452	1.5	.1	14,754,032	32,642	0.460	5.0%	3.540	95.0%	67.263	1.05
Kotzebue	3,705	1.4	.3	103,226,300	27,861	0.393	11.8%	68.738	88.2%	514.486	1.13
Koyuk	224	1.5	.1	7,311,733	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1.754	95.0%	33.334	1.05
Koyukuk	138	1.5	.1	4,504,550	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1.316	95.0%	25.000	1.05
Kupreanof	52	1.5	.1	1,697,367	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1.316	95.0%	25.000	1.05
Kwethluk	541	1.5	.1	17,659,140	32,642	0.460	5.0%	4.237	95.0%	80.507	1.05
Lake and Peninsula Borough	1,198	1.4	.3	41,579,700	34,708	0.489	14.7%	28.627	85.3%	166.358	1.17
Larsen Bay	149	1.5	.1	3,268,300	21,935	0.309	5.0%	1.316	95.0%	25.000	1.05
Lower Kalskag	273	1.5	.1	8,911,174	32,642	0.460	5.0%	2.138	95.0%	40.626	1.05
Manokotak	370	1.5	.1	12,077,416	32,642	0.460	5.0%	2.898	95.0%	55.061	1.05
Marshall	294	1.5	.1	9,596,649	32,642	0.460	5.0%	2.303	95.0%	43.751	1.05
Malanuska-Susitna Borough	30,917	1.0	1.0	1,447,950,990	46,833	0.660	30.0%	1,312.622	70.0%	3,062.785	1.43
McGrath	533	1.5	.1	17,398,007	32,642	0.460	5.0%	4.175	95.0%	79.317	1.05
Mekoryuk	190	1.5	.1	6,201,916	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1.488	95.0%	28.274	1.05
Mountain Village	742	1.5	.1	24,220,115	32,642	0.460	5.0%	5.812	95.0%	110.419	1.05
Napakiaik	315	1.5	.1	10,282,124	32,642	0.460	5.0%	2.467	95.0%	46.876	1.05

TABLE 1

REVISED MUNICIPAL MATCHING GRANT PROGRAM

Local Share % = Col. D x Col. Fa

Total State Funds (\$000): 58,050.0
 Minimum State Share (\$000): 25.0
 Maximum Local Share (%): 30%
 Minimum Local Share (%): 5%

Population Factors:	Under 1,000	1,000-4,999	5,000-10,000	Over 10,000
For Grant Allocation:	1.5	1.4	1.2	1.0
For Local Share %:	0.1	0.3	0.7	1.0

(A) Community	(B) Population	(C) Allocation Population Factor	(D) Local Share % Population Factor	(E) DCRA Assessed Full Value (\$)	(F) Per Capita Value (\$)	(Fa) Local Wealth Factor	(H) LOCAL SHARE %	(I) \$000	(J) STATE SHARE %	(K) \$000	(L) Leverage Ratio
Napaskiak	331	1.5	.1	10,804,391	32,642	0.460	5.0%	2,592	95.0%	49,257	1.05
Nenana	555	1.5	.1	16,186,800	29,165	0.411	5.0%	4,347	95.0%	82,591	1.05
New Stuyahok	374	1.5	.1	12,207,982	32,642	0.460	5.0%	2,929	95.0%	55,656	1.05
Newhalen	168	1.5	.1	3,602,800	21,445	0.302	5.0%	1,316	95.0%	25,000	1.05
Nikolai	113	1.5	.1	3,688,508	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1,316	95.0%	25,000	1.05
Nome	4,303	1.4	.3	137,990,000	32,068	0.452	13.6%	93,778	86.4%	597,526	1.16
Nondalton	229	1.5	.1	3,804,400	16,613	0.234	5.0%	1,794	95.0%	34,078	1.05
Noorvik	600	1.5	.1	6,457,500	10,763	0.152	5.0%	4,699	95.0%	89,287	1.05
North Pole	1,610	1.4	.3	184,583,000	114,648	1.617	30.0%	95,815	70.0%	223,569	1.43
North Slope Borough	2,285	1.4	.3	11,883,976,500	5,200,865	73.335	30.0%	135,986	70.0%	317,301	1.43
Northwest Arctic Borough	315	1.5	.1	4,110,500	13,049	0.184	5.0%	2,467	95.0%	46,876	1.05
Nuiqsut	324	1.5	.1	11,996,900	37,027	0.522	5.2%	2,656	94.8%	48,215	1.06
Nulato	362	1.5	.1	11,816,282	32,642	0.460	5.0%	2,835	95.0%	53,870	1.05
Nunapitchuk	372	1.5	.1	12,142,699	32,642	0.460	5.0%	2,914	95.0%	55,358	1.05
Old Harbor	322	1.5	.1	5,787,400	17,973	0.253	5.0%	2,522	95.0%	47,918	1.05
Ouzinkie	204	1.5	.1	3,245,100	15,907	0.224	5.0%	1,598	95.0%	30,358	1.05
Palmer	2,988	1.4	.3	104,192,300	34,870	0.492	14.8%	71,794	85.2%	414,922	1.17
Pelican	251	1.5	.1	10,440,800	41,597	0.587	5.9%	2,327	94.1%	37,352	1.06
Petersburg	3,440	1.4	.3	162,441,900	47,221	0.666	20.0%	119,239	80.0%	477,688	1.25
Pilot Station	455	1.5	.1	14,851,957	32,642	0.460	5.0%	3,564	95.0%	67,710	1.05
Point Hope	610	1.5	.1	7,034,600	11,532	0.163	5.0%	4,778	95.0%	90,775	1.05
Port Alexander	119	1.5	.1	3,884,358	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1,316	95.0%	25,000	1.05
Port Heiden	121	1.5	.1	2,675,400	22,111	0.312	5.0%	1,316	95.0%	25,000	1.05
Port Lions	300	1.5	.1	6,969,600	23,232	0.328	5.0%	2,350	95.0%	44,644	1.05
Quinhagak	499	1.5	.1	16,288,190	32,642	0.460	5.0%	3,908	95.0%	74,257	1.05
Ruby	243	1.5	.1	7,931,924	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1,903	95.0%	36,161	1.05
Russian Mission	266	1.5	.1	8,682,683	32,642	0.460	5.0%	2,033	95.0%	39,584	1.05
Sand Point	993	1.5	.1	39,039,700	39,315	0.554	5.5%	8,673	94.5%	147,771	1.06
Savoonga	511	1.5	.1	16,679,890	32,642	0.460	5.0%	4,002	95.0%	76,043	1.05
Saxman	308	1.5	.1	13,305,600	43,200	0.609	6.1%	2,973	93.9%	45,834	1.06
Scammon Bay	306	1.5	.1	9,988,349	32,642	0.460	5.0%	2,397	95.0%	45,537	1.05

TABLE 1

REVISED MUNICIPAL MATCHING GRANT PROGRAM

Local Share % = Col. D x Col. Fa

Total State Funds (\$000):	58,050.0
Minimum State Share (\$000):	25.0
Maximum Local Share (%):	30%
Minimum Local Share (%):	5%

Population	Under	1,000	5,000-	Over
Factors:	1,000	4,999	10,000	10,000
For Grant Allocation:	1.5	1.4	1.2	1.0
For Local Share %:	0.1	0.1	0.7	1.0

(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(Fa)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)
Community	Population	Allocation Population Factor	Local Share % Population Factor	DCRA Assessed Full Value (\$)	Per Capita Value (\$)	Local Wealth Factor	LOCAL SHARE %	STATE SHARE \$000	STATE SHARE %	STATE SHARE \$000	Leverage Ratio
Solawik	672	1.5	.1	7,930,700	11,802	0.166	5.0%	5.263	95.0%	100.002	1.05
Soldovia	565	1.5	.1	21,089,400	37,326	0.526	5.3%	4.671	94.7%	84.079	1.06
Seward	2,829	1.4	.3	139,627,200	49,356	0.696	20.9%	103.661	79.1%	392.843	1.26
Shageluk	152	1.5	.1	4,961,533	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1.316	95.0%	25.000	1.05
Shaktolik	197	1.5	.1	6,430,408	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1.543	95.0%	29.316	1.05
Sheldon Point	131	1.5	.1	4,276,058	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1.316	95.0%	25.000	1.05
Shishmaref	430	1.5	.1	14,035,916	32,642	0.460	5.0%	3.368	95.0%	63.989	1.05
Shungnak	214	1.5	.1	2,963,300	13,847	0.195	5.0%	1.676	95.0%	31.846	1.05
Sitka, City and Borough of	8,257	1.2	.7	446,849,500	54,116	0.763	30.0%	420.979	70.0%	982.284	1.43
Skagway	704	1.5	.1	54,411,100	77,288	1.090	10.9%	12.814	89.1%	104.764	1.12
Soldotna	3,733	1.4	.3	200,457,100	53,699	0.757	22.7%	152.360	77.3%	518.374	1.29
St. George	188	1.5	.1	6,136,633	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1.472	95.0%	27.977	1.05
St. Mary's	491	1.5	.1	4,184,700	8,523	0.120	5.0%	3.846	95.0%	73.067	1.05
St. Michael	303	1.5	.1	9,890,424	32,642	0.460	5.0%	2.373	95.0%	45.090	1.05
St. Paul	586	1.5	.1	19,128,015	32,642	0.460	5.0%	4.590	95.0%	87.204	1.05
Stebbins	394	1.5	.1	12,860,816	32,642	0.460	5.0%	3.086	95.0%	58.632	1.05
Tanana	414	1.5	.1	11,511,900	27,807	0.392	5.0%	3.243	95.0%	61.608	1.05
Teller	237	1.5	.1	7,736,074	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1.856	95.0%	35.268	1.05
Tonakee Springs	108	1.5	.1	3,525,300	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1.316	95.0%	25.000	1.05
Thorne Bay	525	1.5	.1	17,136,874	32,642	0.460	5.0%	4.112	95.0%	78.126	1.05
Togiak	713	1.5	.1	23,273,507	32,642	0.460	5.0%	5.584	95.0%	106.103	1.05
Toksook Bay	446	1.5	.1	14,558,182	32,642	0.460	5.0%	3.493	95.0%	66.370	1.05
Tulukcak	357	1.5	.1	11,653,074	32,642	0.460	5.0%	2.796	95.0%	53.126	1.05
Unalakleet	740	1.5	.1	24,154,832	32,642	0.460	5.0%	5.796	95.0%	110.121	1.05
Unalaska	2,265	1.4	.3	116,125,240	51,269	0.723	21.7%	87.104	78.3%	314.524	1.28
Upper Kalskag	149	1.5	.1	4,863,608	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1.316	95.0%	25.000	1.05
Valdez	7,193	1.2	.7	1,370,370,900	190,515	2.686	30.0%	366.731	70.0%	855.706	1.43
Wainwright	512	1.5	.1	3,692,900	7,213	0.102	5.0%	4.010	95.0%	76.192	1.05
Wales	161	1.5	.1	5,255,308	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1.316	95.0%	25.000	1.05
Wasilla	3,342	1.4	.3	228,384,700	68,358	0.964	28.9%	188.707	71.1%	464.079	1.41
White Mountain	180	1.5	.1	5,875,500	32,642	0.460	5.0%	1.410	95.0%	26.786	1.05

TABLE 1

REVISED MUNICIPAL MATCHING GRANT PROGRAM

Local Share % = Col. D x Col. Fa

Total State Funds (\$000):	58,050.0	<i>Population</i>	Under	1,000-	5,000-	Over
Minimum State Share (\$000):	25.0	<i>Factors:</i>	1,000	4,999	10,000	10,000
Maximum Local Share (%):	30%	<i>For Grant Allocation:</i>	1.5	1.4	1.2	1.0
Minimum Local Share (%):	5%	<i>For Local Share %:</i>	0.1	0.3	0.7	1.0

(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(Fa)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)
Community	Population	Allocation Population Factor	Local Share % Population Factor	DCRA Assessed Full Value (\$)	Per Capita Value (\$)	Local Wealth Factor	LOCAL SHARE %	\$000	STATE SHARE %	\$000	Leverage Ratio
Whittier	299	1.5	.1	18,415,600	61,591	0.868	8.7%	4.232	91.3%	44.495	1.10
Wrangell	2,630	1.4	.3	110,198,000	41,900	0.591	17.7%	78.677	82.3%	365.209	1.22
Yakutat	527	1.5	.1	19,792,100	37,556	0.530	5.3%	4.385	94.7%	78.424	1.06
TOTAL:	158			\$37,413,729,446			26%	20,744.651	74%	58,050.000	1.36

STATEWIDE AVERAGE:

\$70,919 1.000

TABLE 1

REVISED MUNICIPAL MATCHING GRANT PROGRAM

Local Share % = Col. D x Col. Fa

Total State Funds (\$000):	58,050.0	Population	Under	1,000-	5,000-	Over
Minimum State Share (\$000):	25.0	Factors:	1,000	4,999	10,000	10,000
Maximum Local Share (%):	30%	For Grant Allocation:	1.5	1.4	1.2	1.0
Minimum Local Share (%):	5%	For Local Share %:	0.1	0.3	0.7	1.0

(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(Fa)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)
Community	Population	Allocation Population Factor	Local Share % Population Factor	DCRA Assessed Full Value (\$)	Per Capita Value (\$)	Local Wealth Factor	LOCAL SHARE %	STATE SHARE %	STATE SHARE \$000	Leverage Ratio	

NOTES:

Col. A - Excludes unincorporated communities outside boroughs, Mollakatta, and seven incorporated communities of uncertain dissolution status (Akiachak, Amautluak, Kasigluk, Newtok, Nightmute, Platinum and Tununak).

Col. B - Population figures shown are those used by DCRA for the FY 91 State revenue sharing program.

Col. E - Taxable property full and true value, including oil and gas property, as established by DCRA (State Assessor).

Communities showing a per capita value of \$32,642 are communities with population less than 750 people whose full value (Col. D) has not been assessed. DCRA establishes full values for these communities by calculating a weighted average per capita full valuation for all communities of less than 750 population for which assessments have been made, and multiplying that per capita full value by the populations of the former set of unassessed communities to produce full values for them. Generally, but not exclusively, these unassessed communities lie within the Unorganized Borough, while the set of assessed communities of population less than 750 lies within organized boroughs.

Col. F -

Col. G - Equals local per capita value (Col. E) divided by the statewide average per capita value (bottom of Col. E).

Col. I - Equals product of population factor (Col. C) and local wealth factor (Col. F). The minimum and maximum local shares (percentages) of project cost are shown with the assumptions above the table.

Col. J - Equals 1 minus the local share (Col. G).

Col. K - Equals pro rata share of Total State Funds, based on local population, net of instances where the Minimum State Share (shown above table) is applied.

Col. L - Equals 1 divided by the state share percentage (Col. I).

Source: OMB/JF

File: CAPITAL4.XLS

CS FOR SENATE BILL NO. 141 (CRA)
IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA
SEVENTEENTH LEGISLATURE - FIRST SESSION

BY THE SENATE COMMUNITY AND REGIONAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Offered:
Referred:

Sponsor(s): SENATE RULES/GOVERNOR

A BILL

FOR AN ACT ENTITLED

1 "An Act establishing a capital project matching grant program for municipalities and a
2 capital project matching grant program for unincorporated communities; relating to the
3 adoption of regulations involving the administration of certain grants; and providing for
4 an effective date."

5 **BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:**

6 * Section 1. AS 29.60 is amended by adding a new section to read:

7 **ARTICLE 7. CAPITAL PROJECT MATCHING GRANTS.**

8 **Sec. 29.60.500. MUNICIPAL CAPITAL PROJECT MATCHING GRANT PROGRAM.**

9 (a) The municipal capital project matching grant fund is established in the Department of
10 Administration consisting of appropriations to the fund. Appropriations do not lapse except as
11 provided under (f) of this section. Interest earned on money in the fund shall be deposited by
12 the department into the general fund. Appropriations shall be allocated by the department each
13 fiscal year to individual grant accounts for each municipality. The amount allocated to a grant
14 account is determined by multiplying the total amount appropriated to the fund during a fiscal

1 year by a fraction, the denominator of which equals the population of all municipalities and the
2 numerator of which equals

3 (1) for a municipality with a population under 1,000, the amount equal to that
4 population multiplied by 1.5;

5 (2) for a municipality with a population of at least 1,000 but less than 5,000, the
6 amount equal to that population multiplied by 1.4;

7 (3) for a municipality with population of at least 5,000 but not greater than
8 10,000, the amount equal to that population multiplied by 1.2; or

9 (4) for a municipality with a population of over 10,000, the amount equal to that
10 population.

11 (b) The minimum amount allocated to the grant account of a municipality each fiscal
12 year under (a) of this section equals \$25,000. The department shall reduce allocations under (a)
13 of this section on a pro rata basis if necessary to fund the minimum amount for each
14 municipality. If appropriations are not sufficient to fully fund minimum amounts, the amount
15 available shall be equally allocated to each municipality.

16 (c) Subject to (d) and (e) of this section, each municipality may draw amounts from its
17 grant account for planning, design, and construction of capital projects or capital improvements,
18 as defined in AS 37.07.120. In accepting a draw, the municipality covenants with the state that
19 it will operate and maintain the facility for which the draw is used for the practical life of the
20 facility, and that the municipality will not rely on the state to operate or maintain the facility or
21 pay for the operation or maintenance of the facility. This requirement does not apply to use of
22 money from a draw for repair or improvement of an existing facility that is operated or
23 maintained by the state at the time that the money is made if the repair or improvement for
24 which the draw is used will not substantially increase the operating or maintenance costs to the
25 state. The municipality, its agents, contractors, and subcontractors shall comply with the hiring
26 preferences under AS 36.10 in hiring employees to be paid wholly or in part with money from
27 a draw.

28 (d) The municipality shall contribute a local share to be used on each capital project or
29 improvement for which a draw is made. The amount of the local share equals the local share
30 factor multiplied by the amount of the draw. The local share factor equals the local share
31 percentage divided by the state share percentage. The local share percentage equals the

1 population factor multiplied by the local wealth factor. The state share percentage equals one
2 minus the local share percentage. For purposes of this subsection, the

3 (1) local share percentage equals the population factor multiplied by the local
4 wealth factor except that

5 (A) if the product of the population factor and the local wealth factor is
6 greater than or equal to 1.0, the local share percentage equals 1.0; or

7 (B) if the local wealth factor is 0, the local share percentage equals 0.11;

8 (2) population factor equals

9 (A) 0.1 if the population of the municipality is less than 1,000;

10 (B) 0.3 if the population of the municipality is at least 1,000 but less than
11 5,000;

12 (C) 0.7 if the population of the municipality is at least 5,000 but not more
13 than 10,000; or

14 (D) 1.0 if the population of the municipality is more than 10,000;

15 (3) local wealth factor equals the amount obtained by dividing the per capita
16 taxable real and personal property valuation of the municipality by the statewide average per
17 capita taxable real and personal property valuation of all municipalities in the state.

18 (e) The amount of the local share calculated under (d) of this section shall be adjusted
19 if necessary so that it does not exceed 30 percent of the amount of the draw and is not less than
20 five percent of the amount of the draw. The local share may be satisfied with federal or
21 municipal funds, locally contributed materials or equipment the value of which shall be
22 determined by the department, or money from another nonstate source. The local share may not
23 be satisfied with money from appropriations, allocations, entitlements, grants, or other payments
24 from the state.

25 (f) A municipality shall repay to the department money drawn from a grant account if
26 substantial, ongoing work on the project or improvement is not started within five years after the
27 effective date of the appropriation from which the draw is funded. Money repaid shall be
28 deposited into the general fund. Money from an allocation to a grant account that has not been
29 drawn out by the municipality within five years after the effective date of the appropriation from
30 which the allocation is funded lapses into the general fund.

31 (g) The department under the Administrative Procedure Act (AS 44.62) may adopt

1 regulations that impose additional requirements or procedures to implement, interpret, make
 2 specific, or otherwise carry out the provisions of this section, including provisions for mandatory
 3 audits and reports. Regulations adopted under this subsection shall comply with AS 37.05 (Fiscal
 4 Procedures Act), AS 37.07 (Executive Budget Act), and requirements of the federal government
 5 for participation in federal programs.

6 (h) For purposes of this section, the population of a borough shall exclude the population
 7 of each city in the borough and the per capita taxable real and personal property valuation of a
 8 borough shall exclude the property valuation of each city in the borough. The determination of
 9 population and per capita taxable real and personal property valuation for a municipality shall
 10 be based upon data used by the Department of Community and Regional Affairs under
 11 AS 14.17.140, AS 29.45.110, and AS 29.60.140 - 29.60.150.

12 (i) In this section, "department" means the Department of Administration.

13 * Sec. 2. AS 37.05.318 is amended to read:

14 Sec. 37.05.318. [FURTHER] REGULATIONS. The Department of Administration
 15 under [PROHIBITED. NOTWITHSTANDING] the Administrative Procedure Act (AS 44.62)
 16 [, THE FISCAL PROCEDURES ACT (AS 37.05), AND THE EXECUTIVE BUDGET ACT

17 (AS 37.07), A STATE AGENCY] may [NOT] adopt regulations that [OR] impose additional
 18 requirements or procedures to implement, interpret, make specific, or otherwise carry out the
 19 provisions of AS 37.05.315 - 37.05.317, including provisions for mandatory audits and
 20 reports. Regulations adopted under this section shall comply with this chapter, AS 37.07
 21 (Executive Budget Act), and requirements of [UNLESS REQUIRED BY] the federal
 22 government for participation in federal programs.

23 * Sec. 3. AS 44.47 is amended by adding a new section to article 3 to read:

24 Sec. 44.47.195. UNINCORPORATED COMMUNITY CAPITAL PROJECT MATCHING
 25 GRANT PROGRAM. (a) The unincorporated community capital project matching grant fund
 26 is established in the department consisting of appropriations to the fund. Appropriations do not
 27 lapse except as provided under (f) of this section. Interest earned on money in the fund shall be
 28 deposited by the department into the general fund. Appropriations shall be allocated by the
 29 department each fiscal year to individual grant accounts for each unincorporated community that
 30 is entitled to receive state aid under AS 29.60.140 during that fiscal year. The amount allocated
 31 to a grant account is determined by dividing the total amount appropriated to the fund during a

1 fiscal year by the number of communities eligible for allocations during that fiscal year.

2 (b) By February 1, the department shall determine the amount of appropriations needed
3 to provide an allocation of \$25,000 under (a) of this section for each unincorporated community
4 for the next fiscal year. The department shall request the legislature for an appropriation to the
5 unincorporated community capital project matching grant fund of at least that amount.

6 (c) Subject to (d) and (e) of this section, an incorporated nonprofit entity or a
7 Native village council may on behalf of each unincorporated community draw amounts from that
8 community's grant account for planning, design, and construction of capital projects or capital
9 improvements, as defined in AS 37.07.120. In accepting a draw, the incorporated entity or
10 council covenants with the state that it will operate and maintain the facility for which the draw
11 is used for the practical life of the facility, and that the incorporated entity or council will not
12 rely on the state to operate or maintain the facility or pay for its operation or maintenance. This
13 requirement does not apply to use of money from a draw for repair or improvement of an
14 existing facility that is operated or maintained by the state at the time that the money is made
15 if the repair or improvement for which the draw is used will not substantially increase the
16 operating or maintenance costs to the state. The incorporated entity or council, its agents,
17 contractors, and subcontractors shall comply with the hiring preferences under AS 36.10 in hiring
18 employees to be paid wholly or in part with money from a draw.

19 (d) The department, with advice from the Department of Law, shall determine whether
20 there is in each unincorporated community an incorporated nonprofit entity or a Native village
21 council that will agree to receive and spend money allocated to the community under (a) of this
22 section. If there is more than one qualified entity in the community, the department shall
23 authorize the entity that the department finds most qualified to make draws from the allocation
24 and spend the money. The department may not pay the money to a Native village council unless
25 the council waives immunity from suit for claims arising out of activities of the council related
26 to the draw. A waiver of immunity from suit under this subsection must be on a form provided
27 by the Department of Law. If there is no qualified incorporated nonprofit entity or Native village
28 council in an unincorporated community that is willing to receive money from an allocation
29 under (a) of this section, draws may not be made from the allocation for that unincorporated
30 community and the amount allocated lapses into the general fund. Neither this subsection nor
31 any action taken under it enlarges or diminishes the governmental authority or jurisdiction of a

1 Native village council.

2 (e) The incorporated nonprofit entity or Native village council shall contribute a local
3 share to be used on each capital project or improvement for which a draw is made. The local
4 share equals 10 percent of the amount of the draw. The local share may be satisfied from federal
5 or local money, locally contributed manpower, materials or equipment the value of which shall
6 be determined by the department, or money from another nonstate source. The local share may
7 not be satisfied with money from appropriations, allocations, entitlements, grants, or other
8 payments from the state.

9 (f) An incorporated nonprofit entity or a Native village council shall repay to the
10 department money drawn from a grant account if substantial, ongoing work on the project or
11 improvement is not started within five years after the effective date of the appropriation from
12 which the draw is funded. Money repaid shall be deposited into the general fund. Money from
13 an allocation to a grant account that has not been drawn out by an incorporated nonprofit entity
14 or Native village council within five years after the effective date of the appropriation from
15 which the allocation is funded lapses into the general fund.

16 (g) The department under the Administrative Procedure Act (AS 44.62) may adopt
17 regulations that impose additional requirements or procedures to implement, interpret, make
18 specific, or otherwise carry out the provisions of this section, including provisions for mandatory
19 audits and reports. Regulations adopted under this subsection shall comply with AS 37.05 (Fiscal
20 Procedures Act), AS 37.07 (Executive Budget Act), and requirements of the federal government
21 for participation in federal programs.

22 (h) The limitations of AS 44.47.140 do not apply to grants made under this section.

23 * Sec. 4. This Act takes effect immediately under AS 01.10.040(c).

STATE OF ALASKA

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

WALTER J. HICKEL, GOVERNOR

P.O. BOX AM
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99811-0199
PHONE: (907)-465-3658
FAX: (907)-465-2090

February 26, 1991

Senator Steve Frank
Chairman, Community and Regional Affairs Committee
Alaska State Legislature
P.O. Box V (MS 3100)
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Dear Senator Frank:

Re: Governor's Proposed Amendments to Senate Bill 141
(Capital Project Matching Grant Program)

For your consideration, Governor Hickel wishes to propose three amendments to Senate Bill No. 141, regarding establishment of a capital project matching grant program for municipalities and unincorporated communities.

The proposed amendments are technical in nature, and reflect the original intent of the proposed legislation. We are submitting them now so that they, and the enabling legislation introduced yesterday which they amend, may be considered as a whole.

The three proposed amendments are as follows:

- AMENDMENT # 1:

Page 2, Lines 21-22 Change as follows:

"(B) equals 1.0 if the product of the population factor [is 1.0] and the local wealth factor is greater than or equal to 1.0; or"

This change achieves the intent of the original wording, which is to prevent the state share percentage (Page 3, Line 7) from being negative.

- AMENDMENT # 2:

Page 4, Line 19 Insert "located outside of organized boroughs" after "unincorporated communities".

This phrase was unintentionally dropped during drafting of the proposed bill. Unincorporated communities located within boroughs are treated in Section 1 of the bill.


- AMENDMENT # 3:

Page 6, Line 24 Delete: "This Act takes effect July 1, 1991."
Insert: "This Act takes effect immediately under AS 01.10.070(c)."

This phrase was unintentionally changed during drafting of the proposed bill.

Should you have any questions, or need any additional information, please contact me at 465-3568.

Sincerely,



J. Shelby Stastny
Director

Senate Bill 142
 FY 1991 Unincorporated Community Grants

	Election District	State Share	Local Share	Local Match %
Hyder	1	\$15,000	\$1,667	10.0%
Myers Chuck	1	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Edna Bay	2	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Gustavus	2	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Hollis	2	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Klukwan	2	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Point Baker	2	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Port Protection	2	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Whale Pass	2	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Elfin Cove	3	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Chenega	6	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Chitina	6	15,000	1,667	10.0%
McCarthy	6	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Tatitlek	6	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Chicken	17	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Chistochina	17	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Copper Center	17	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Deltana	17	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Dot Lake	17	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Dot Lake Services	17	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Dry Creek	17	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Eagle Village	17	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Four Mile Road Community	17	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Gakona	17	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Glenallen	17	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Gulkana	17	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Healy Lake	17	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Kenny Lake	17	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Mendeltna	17	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Mentasta	17	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Northway	17	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Panguingue Creek	17	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Paxson	17	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Slana	17	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Tanacross	17	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Tazlina	17	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Tetlin	17	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Tok	17	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Tolsona	17	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Tonsina	17	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Central	18	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Circle	18	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Livengood	19	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Chuloonawik	23	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Council	23	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Hamilton	23	15,000	1,667	10.0%
King Island	23	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Solomon	23	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Arctic Village	24	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Beaver	24	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Birch Creek	24	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Chalkyitsik	24	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Crooked Creek	24	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Evansville	24	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Line Village	24	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Manley Hot Springs	24	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Minchumina	24	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Minto	24	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Pitka's Point	24	15,000	1,667	10.0%

Rampart	24	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Red Devil	24	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Sleetmute	24	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Stevens Village	24	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Stony River	24	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Takotna	24	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Talida	24	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Venete	24	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Wiseman	24	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Kipnuk	25	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Kongiganak	25	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Kwigillingok	25	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Oscarville	25	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Tuntutuliak	25	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Ekuk	26	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Koliganek	26	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Nikolski	26	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Portage Creek	26	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Twin Hills	26	15,000	1,667	10.0%
Total:		\$1,170,000	\$130,000	

Office of the Governor, Office of Management and Budget

STATE OF ALASKA

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

WALTER J. HICKEL, GOVERNOR

P.O. BOX AM

JUNEAU, ALASKA 99811-0195

PHONE: (907)-465-3658

FAX: (907)-465-2090

February 26, 1991

Senator Steve Frank
Chairman, Community and Regional Affairs Committee
Alaska State Legislature
P.O. Box V (MS 3100)
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Dear Senator Frank:

Re: Governor's Proposed Amendments to Senate Bill 141
(Capital Project Matching Grant Program)

For your consideration, Governor Hickel wishes to propose three amendments to Senate Bill No. 141, regarding establishment of a capital project matching grant program for municipalities and unincorporated communities.

The proposed amendments are technical in nature, and reflect the original intent of the proposed legislation. We are submitting them now so that they, and the enabling legislation introduced yesterday which they amend, may be considered as a whole.

The three proposed amendments are as follows:

- AMENDMENT # 1:

Page 2, Lines 21-22 Change as follows:

"(B) equals 1.0 if the product of the population factor [is 1.0] and the local wealth factor is greater than or equal to 1.0; or"

This change achieves the intent of the original wording, which is to prevent the state share percentage (Page 3, Line 7) from being negative.

- AMENDMENT # 2:

Page 4, Line 19

Insert "located outside of organized boroughs" after "unincorporated communities".

This phrase was unintentionally dropped during drafting of the proposed bill. Unincorporated communities located within boroughs are treated in Section 1 of the bill.

- AMENDMENT # 3:

Page 6, Line 24


Delete: "This Act takes effect July 1, 1991."

Insert: "This Act takes effect immediately under AS 01.10.070(c)."

This phrase was unintentionally changed during drafting of the proposed bill.

Should you have any questions, or need any additional information, please contact me at 465-3568.

Sincerely,



J. Shelby Stastny
Director

Sec. 14.17.050. Teachers' salary allotment. [Repealed, § 1 ch 238 SLA 1970.]

Sec. 14.17.051. Area cost differential. The area cost differential for a school district is as follows:

School District	Area Cost Differential
Adak	1.27
Alaska Gateway	1.19
Aleutian Region	1.31
Anchorage	1.00
Annette Island	1.03
Bering Strait	1.39
Bristol Bay	1.27
Chatham	1.03
Chugach	1.14
Copper River	1.14
Cordova	1.11
Craig	1.03
Delta/Greely	1.16
Dillingham	1.27
Fairbanks	1.04
Galena	1.30
Haines	1.05
Hoonah	1.08
Hydaburg	1.03
Iditarod	1.33
Juneau	1.00
Kake	1.03
Kashunamiut	1.33
Kenai	1.00
Ketchikan	1.00
King Cove	1.27
Klawock	1.03
Kodiak	1.09
Kuspuk	1.33
Lake & Peninsula	1.31
Lower Kuskokwim	1.42
Lower Yukon	1.35
Matanuska-Susitna	1.00
Nenana	1.20
Nome	1.34
North Slope	1.45
Northwest Arctic	1.45
Pelican	1.08
Petersburg	1.00

Pribilof
 Railbelt
 Sand I
 Sitka
 Skagway
 Southeast
 South
 St. Mary
 Tanana
 Unalaska
 Valdez
 Wrangell
 Yakutat
 Yukon
 Yukon
 Yupik
 Yuyiat
 (§ 4 ch 2
 1975; am
 ch 115 S
 am § 7

Effect of
 amendmen

Sec. 1
 value is
 § 1 ch 1
 1976; an
 ch 26 SI
 am § 8

Effect of
 amendmen
 ning of th
 ceding "i

Sec. 1
 § 1 ch .

Sec. 1
 1987.]

§ 14.17.051

led, § 1 ch 238

Cost differential

Cost differential

§ 14.17.056

EDUCATION

§ 14.17.061

Pribilof	1.30
Railbelt	1.23
Sand Point	1.27
Sitka	1.00
Skagway	1.05
Southeast Island	1.04
Southwest Region	1.31
St. Mary's	1.30
Tanana	1.30
Unalaska	1.27
Valdez	1.11
Wrangell	1.00
Yakutat	1.08
Yukon Flats	1.46
Yukon-Koyukuk	1.34
Yupitit	1.41

(§ 4 ch 238 SLA 1970; am § 1 ch 40 SLA 1971; am § 5 ch 81 SLA 1975; am § 12 ch 124 SLA 1975; am § 8 ch 90 SLA 1977; am §§ 3 — 6 ch 115 SLA 1978; am § 12 ch 26 SLA 1980; am § 6 ch 119 SLA 1981; am § 7 ch 75 SLA 1986; am § 8 ch 91 SLA 1987)

Effect of amendments. — The 1986 amendment rewrote this section. The 1987 amendment rewrote this section.

Sec. 14.17.056. Instructional unit value. The instructional unit value is \$60,000. (§ 4 ch 238 SLA 1970; am § 1 ch 88 SLA 1973; am § 1 ch 140 SLA 1974; am § 6 ch 81 SLA 1975; am § 3 ch 173 SLA 1976; am § 10 ch 90 SLA 1977; am § 7 ch 115 SLA 1978; am §§ 13, 14 ch 26 SLA 1980; am § 5 ch 119 SLA 1981; am § 28 ch 59 SLA 1982; am § 8 ch 75 SLA 1986; am § 9 ch 91 SLA 1987)

Effect of amendments. — The 1987 amendment deleted "Base" at the beginning of the catchline, deleted "base" preceding "instructional" and substituted "value is \$60,000" for "for fiscal years beginning on or after July 1, 1986, is \$42,184."

Sec. 14.17.060. Average daily membership allotment. [Repealed, § 1 ch 238 SLA 1970.]

Sec. 14.17.061. Supplemental programs. [Repealed, § 25 ch 91 SLA 1987.]

- 1) The bill as written has the smaller villages too low as compared to the larger villages. Especially the unincorporated villages which are given fifteen thousand dollars no matter what the population of the village is. An effort should be made to bring that amount up and give them a population factor.
- 2) ~~The economies of scale~~ factor that separate the larger population areas and the smaller ones needs to be addressed. Some kind of sliding scale formula needs to be made to bring it somewhere close to being fair. I can see this bill as written is as much a 3 or 4: 1 out of line although yours probably can't make that big of adjustment.
- 3) Small villages will have to save their yearly amounts to accumulate enough to build anything of significance and so the amount will be from \$200,000 on up. That presents an almost insurmountable obstacle in my view for the local share portion to be accumulated. ~~Some mechanism needs to be made where it's possible to use the interest.~~ (Constitutional problems on dedicated funds) or some kind of sliding scale downward on the local share which would match what the interest would have brought in for the account.
- 4) Also in general I believe the matching portions as the progress upward toward ~~the 50% match is too high.~~ I don't know what the number should be, but it might hang up the bill.
- 5) Also this bill is a very good vehicle to use the local share as an incentive to use "Home grown products." I'm not just talking about trading goods, I'm talking about things like Alaska forest products, Alaska petroleum products like asphalt that is produced at MAPCO ect. This is a resource state an too many of our dollars leave the state that could stay here longer and turn over more to produce more business development. Boardwalks are a thing that immediately comes to mind. In the Kuskokwim and Yukon Delta, all them board walks are bought in the lower 48 and transported at great cost and just assembled at the village yet on both rivers miles of forest is there and a few sawmills with limited business. Community halls could be constructed using local resources ect.
- 6) Also sec 2. of the bill can cause some problems as it should probably be made to apply only to this bill.

LEGISLATIVE TELECONFERENCE NETWORK

SIGN-IN SHEET



SPONSOR: _____

SUBJECT: _____

START/END TIME: _____ DATE: _____

PLEASE PRINT

TO TESTIFY

	NAME/REPRESENTING	ADDRESS	PHONE #	TESTIFY	OBSERVE	BILL #
1	Albert Dick	Mayor of Anchorage				
2	Judy Brady	ANCHORAGE				
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						
11						
12						
13						
14						
15						
16						
17						
18						

SPONSOR: S, CRA
SUBJECT: SB 141
MODERATOR: PHYLLIS
SITE: BARROW

PARTICIPANT LIST #1

TESTIFIED

NAME/REPRESENTING	ADDRESS	PHONE	BILL NO.
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			

OBSERVED

NAME/REPRESENTING	ADDRESS	PHONE	BILL NO.
1. MARK HAMLIN/NORTH SLOPE BOROUGH,	BOX 69	852-0210	SB 141
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			

T/C NO: 91-03-053
DATE: MARCH 14, 1991
SPONSOR: SENATE COMMUNITY AND REGIONAL AFFAIRS
SUBJECT: SB141
MODERATOR: ROXANNE BARRON
SITE: NOME

PARTICIPANT LIST

TESTIFIED

NAME/REPRESENTING	ADDRESS	PHONE	BILL NO.
1. PAUL MERKOURIS/NOME	JOINT UTILITIES POB	70	
2. JOHN HANDELAND/CITY OF NOME	POB 281		
3.			
4.			
5.			

OBSERVED

NAME/REPRESENTING	ADDRESS	PHONE	BILL NO.
-------------------	---------	-------	----------

T/C NO: 91-03-053
DATE: MARCH 14, 1991
SPONSOR: (S) C&RA
SUBJECT: MATCHING GRANTS FOR CAPITOL PROJECTS
MODERATOR: JANET L. VENES
SITE: BETHEL L.I.O.

PARTICIPANT LIST

TESTIFIED

NAME/REPRESENTING	ADDRESS	PHONE	BILL NO.
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			

OBSERVED

NAME/REPRESENTING	ADDRESS	PHONE	BILL NO.
1. MARK EARNEST	CITY OF BETHEL BOX 388, BET.	543-2047	
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			

TESTIFIED:

TTC NO: 91-03-053
DATE: 3/14/91
SPONSOR: SENATE C&RA
SUBJECT: SB141
MODERATOR: MARY
SITE: MATSU

PARTICIPANT LIST

TESTIFIED

NAME/REPRESENTING	ADDRESS	PHONE	BILL NO.
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			

OBSERVED

NAME/REPRESENTING	ADDRESS	PHONE	BILL NO.
1. DAVE SOULAK; CITY MANAGER, PALMER			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			

TESTIFIED: 0

* FROM: LTCCGLN *
* SUBJECT: 91-04-121, PL, GRANTS 041891 *
* PRINT DATE: 04/18/91 TIME: 15:42 *
* *

SUBJECT LINE TO READ: TC NO.; PL/FS; SHORT SUBJECT; DATE

T/C NO: 91-04-121
DATE: 04-18-91
SPONSOR: (S) COMMUNITY & REGIONAL AFFAIRS
SUBJECT: MATCHING GRANTS
MODERATOR: PATSY HILL
SITE: GLENNALLEN

PARTICIPANT LIST

To TESTIFY

~~TESTIFIED~~

NAME/REPRESENTING ADDRESS PHONE BILL NO.
1. FRANK FIALA
2.
3.
4.
5.

OBSERVED

NAME/REPRESENTING ADDRESS PHONE BILL NO.

```

* DELIVER TO: LIOCACE
*
* ORIGINAL
* SENT: 04/18/91 TIME: 15:47
* FROM: LTCCMAT
* SUBJECT: 121PL SCRA SB 141 4/18
* PRINT DATE: 04/18/91 TIME: 15:47
*
*****

```

SUBJECT LINE TO READ: TC NO, ; PL/FS, SHORT SUBJECT; DATE

```

T/C NO: 91-04-121
DATE: 4/18/91
SPONSOR: S CRA
SUBJECT: SB 141 MATCHING CAP GRANTS
MODERATOR: CHARLOTTE
SITE: MAT-SU LIO

```

PARTICIPANT LIST 1

TO TESTIEY
 1 DAVE SOULAK, CITY MGR PALMER

WANTS TO LISTEN AWHILE FIRST

2

OBSERVED:

NAME/REPRESENTING	ADDRESS	PHONE	BILL NO.
1			
2			

* PRINT DATE: 04/18/91 TIME: 15:52

*

*

*

SUBJECT LINE TO READ: TC NO.; PL/FS; SHORT SUBJECT; DATE

T/C NO: 91-04-121
 DATE: APRIL 18, 1991 THURSDAY 3:45 - 5:00 P.M.
 SPONSOR: SENATE COMMUNITY AND REGIONAL AFFAIRS
 SUBJECT: SB 141: MATCHING GRANTS FOR CAPITAL PROJECTS
 MODERATOR: ANNA MAY SORESENSEN
 SITE: DILLINGHAM

PARTICIPANT LIST

~~FINAL STATS~~

TO TESTIFY

~~TESTIFIED~~

NAME/REPRESENTING	ADDRESS	PHONE	BILL NO.
1. JOE MCGILL	MAY WANT TO	TESTIFY	
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			

OBSERVED

NAME/REPRESENTING	ADDRESS	PHONE	BILL NO.
1.			
2.			
3.			

DATE: 03-14-91
SPONSOR: (S) COMMUNITY & REGIONAL AFFAIRS
SUBJECT: MATCHING GRANTS FOR CAPITAL PROJECTS
MODERATOR: PATSY HILL
SITE: GLENNALLEN

PARTICIPANT LIST

TESTIFIED

NAME/REPRESENTING	ADDRESS	PHONE	BILL NO.
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			

OBSERVED

NAME/REPRESENTING	ADDRESS	PHONE	BILL NO.
1. EVELYN BUNCH	BOX 31 GLENNALLEN	822-5555	
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			

```

*****
*
* DELIVER TO: LIOCJAM
*
* ORIGINAL
* SENT: 03/14/91 TIME: 17:23
* FROM: LIOCMIL
* SUBJECT: 91-03-053;FL;GRANTS;3/14
* PRINT DATE: 03/14/91 TIME: 17:23
*
*****

```

SUBJECT LINE TO READ: TC NO.; FL FS; SHORT SUBJECT; DATE

```

T/C NO: 91-03-053
DATE: 3/14
SPONSOR: S C&RA
SUBJECT: SB 141 MATCHING GRANTS
MODERATOR: JUDY
SITE: ANCHORAGE

```

FINAL STATS

```

*****
TO TESTIFY
  NAMES/REPRESENTING      ADDRESS      PHONE      BILL NO.
*****
TO OBSERVE:
  NAME/ REPRESENTING      ADDRESS      PHONE      BILL NO.

```

1. ANNE WILLIAMS/ MUNICIPALITY OF ANCHORAGE 343-4467
2. MARY ANN PEASE/MUNICIPALITY OF ANCHORAGE 343-4282
3. ROSS DUNFEE/MUNICIPALITY OF ANCHORAGE 786-8109
- 4.
- 5.

```

*****
TESTIFIED:
UNABLE:
OBSERVED: 3
TOTAL: 3

```

STARTING TIME: 3:30 P.M. ENDING TIME: 4:38 P.M.

T/C NO: 91-03-053
DATE: 3/14/91
SPONSOR: SENATE C&RA
SUBJECT: SB141
MODERATOR: MARY
SITE: MATSU

PARTICIPANT LIST

TESTIFIED

NAME/REPRESENTING	ADDRESS	PHONE	BILL NO.
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			

OBSERVED

NAME/REPRESENTING	ADDRESS	PHONE	BILL NO.
1. DAVE SOULAR, CITY MANAGER, PALMER			
2. ELSIE O'BRYAN, CITY COUNCIL, HOUSTON			
3.			
4.			
5.			

T/C NO: 91-03-053
DATE: MARCH 14, 1991
SPONSOR: (S) COMMUNITY & REGIONAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
SUBJECT: SB141, MATCHING GRANTS FOR CAPITAL PROJECTS
MODERATOR: RAE RHODES
SITE: KETCHIKAN

PARTICIPANT LIST

TESTIFIED

NAME/REPRESENTING	ADDRESS	PHONE	BILL NO.
-------------------	---------	-------	----------

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

OBSERVED

NAME/RERESENTING	ADDRESS	PHONE	BILL NO.
------------------	---------	-------	----------

1. JACK PEARSON, CITY MANAGER
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

TESTIFIED:
UNABLE:
OBSERVED:

T/C NO: 91-03-079
DATE: 3/26/91
SPONSOR: SENATE C & RA
SUBJECT: SB141 - MATCHING GRANTS
MODERATOR: MARY
SITE: MATSU

PARTICIPANT LIST

TESTIFIED

NAME/REPRESENTING	ADDRESS	PHONE	BILL NO.
1. DAVE SOULAK, CITY MANAGER, CITY OF PALME R			
2. MAYOR DOROTHY JONES, MAT-SU BOROUGH			
3.			
4.			
5.			

OBSERVED

ADDRESS PHONE BILL NO.

SUBJECT LINE TO READ: TC NO.; PL/FS; SHORT SUBJECT; DATE

T/C NO: 91-03-079
DATE: 03-26-91
SPONSOR: (S) COMM./REGINAL AFFAIRS
SUBJECT: MATCHING GRANTS
MODERATOR: PATSY HILL
SITE: GLENNALLEN

PARTICIPANT LIST

TESTIFIED

NAME/REPRESENTING	ADDRESS	PHONE	BILL NO.
1. EVELYN BUNCH,	BOX 322 GLENNALLEN	822-5555	SR 141
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			

DATE: MARCH 25, 1991 TUESDAY
SPONSOR: SENATE COMMUNITY & REGIONAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
SUBJECT: SB 141: MATCHING GRANTS FOR CAPITAL PROJECTS
MODERATOR: KAY GORMAN/ANNA MAY SORENSEN
SITE: DILLINGHAM

PARTICIPANT LIST

FINAL STATS

TESTIFIED

NAME/REPRESENTING	ADDRESS	PHONE	BILL NO.
1. TERRY HOEFFERLE	-TO TESTIFY-	DLG	SB 141
2. MAJOR JOE MCGILL	-TO TESTIFY-	DLG	SB 141
3.			
4.			
5.			

OBSERVED

NAME/REPRESENTING	ADDRESS	PHONE	BILL NO.
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			

TESTIFIED:

UNABLE:
OBSERVED:
TOTAL:

START TIME:

END TIME:

*
* DELIVER TO: LIOCACE *
*
* ORIGINAL *
* SENT: 03/26/91 TIME: 15:41 *
* FROM: LIOCMIL *
* SUBJECT: 91-03-079; FL#2; SB141; 3/26 *
* PRINT DATE: 03/26/91 TIME: 15:41 *
*

SUBJECT LINE TO READ: TC NO.; FL FS; SHORT SUBJECT; DATE

T/C NO: 91-03-079
DATE: 3/26
SF (S) COMMUNITY AND REGIONAL AFFAIRS
SUBJ: SB 141 MATCHING GRANTS
MODE: JUDY
SITE: ANCHORAGE

PARTICIPANT LIST

TO TESTIFY

NUM	NAMES/REPRESENTING	ADDRESS	PHONE	BILL NO.
X	MARY ANN PEASE/MOA		343-4282	
2.	ROSS DUNFEE/MUNI ENGINEER			
3.				

T/C NO: 91-03-053
DATE: MARCH 14, 1991
SPONSOR: SENATE COMMUNITY AND REGIONAL AFFAIRS
SUBJECT: SB141
MODERATOR: FRAN
SITE: FAIRBANKS

PARTICIPANT LIST

TESTIFIED

NAME/REPRESENTING	ADDRESS	PHONE	BILL NO.
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.			
9.			
10.			

OBSERVED

NAME/REPRESENTING	ADDRESS	PHONE	BILL NO.
1. DON LEWELL - FNSB			
2. BOB WOLTING - CITY OF FBX			
3. GUY VAN DOREN - FNSB			
4. MONA LISA DREXLER - FNSB			
5. BOB COGHILL - FNSB			
6. RICK TESSANDORE - ARCTIC ALLIANCE			
7. RICHARD BONWELL - FNSB			
8. KEN RYDBERG - CITY OF FBX			
9.			
10.			

TESTIFIED:
UNABLE:
OBSERVED:
TOTAL:



Alaska State Legislature


SENATE

Official Business

P.O. Box V
State Capitol
Juneau, Alaska 99811

MEMORANDUM

TO: Interested Municipal & City Government Representatives

FROM:  Senator Steve Frank, Chair
Senate Community & Regional Affairs Committee

RE: Senate C&RA Committee Hearing on
SB 141 - Matching Grants for Capital Projects
3:30 Thursday - March 14

DATE: March 12, 1991

This Thursday we will be hearing from the Hickel Administration on the Governor's proposed Capital Matching Grants Program and will be teleconferencing the meeting to various Legislative Information Offices around the State on a "listen only" basis.

Please contact the Legislative Information Office in your area if you want to have them hooked into this hearing via the teleconference network. Currently, we have Anchorage, Mat-Su, Fairbanks, Kodiak and Bethel as participating sites, but we can add them as necessary.

Governor Hickel's Bill (SB 141) would require that local governments match, on a per capita wealth and population basis, state contributions for municipal and unincorporated communities capital projects.

The Committee will only be taking testimony from the Governor's Office and State Agencies in this meeting. However, we will be soliciting both written and oral testimony in subsequent hearings on this bill before we take any formal action.

Copies of the bill and back up material can be obtained from the Legislative Information Office in your area at the time of the hearing. If you have questions please call Rick Solie in my office at 465-3709.

✓ P. 3, l. 21: insert "manpower" labor

✓ P. 3, l. 28: money is repaid to comm's account - not to GF

✓ P. 4, l. 1: change "that" back to "and" NO

✓ P. 4, ll 1-5: add lang. about valuation/confirm. of I-K manpower

- P. 4, l. 17: change "that" back to "and"

- P. 4, l. 24-31: say money must remain in the fund till drawn

- P. 5, ll. 1-5: why not for men's, too?

- P. 5, l. 9: add "for a public purpose"

- P. 5, ll. 6-18: change "facility" to "cap. proj. or cap. improv's"

- P. 5, l. 14: change "money" to "draw"

- P. 6, l. 4: change "draw" to "amt. of proj." (see old P. 3, ll. 11-12);
also, change "10%" to "5%"

- P. 6, l. 12: money stays in comm's account (see old, P. 2, ll. 5-6)

- P. 6, l. 17: change "that" to "and"; also, add manpower valuation/verification

- add back definitions on old P. 4 and old P. 6



Alaska State Legislature


SENATE

Official Business

P.O. Box V
State Capitol
Juneau, Alaska 99811

MEMORANDUM

TO: Interested Individuals

FROM:  Senator Steve Frank, Chairman
Senate Community & Regional Affairs Committee

RE: Senate C&RA Committee Hearing to take Public Testimony on
SB 141 - Matching Grants for Capital Projects
3:30 Tuesday - March 26

DATE: March 15, 1991

The Senate C&RA Committee will be continuing our hearings on the Governor's proposed Capital Matching Grants Program (SB 141). We will be teleconferencing the meeting to various Legislative Information Offices around the State and taking testimony from any individual who wishes to speak to the Committee.

Please contact the Legislative Information Office in your area if you want to have them hooked into this hearing via the teleconference network. Currently, we have Anchorage, Mat-Su, Fairbanks, Glennallen, Barrow, Nome, Kodiak Ketchikan, and Bethel as participating sites, but we can add them as necessary. If you do not have an LIO in your community we can make arrangements to connect you to the teleconference if you let us know.

Governor Hickel's Bill (SB 141) would require that local governments match, on a per capita wealth and population basis, state contributions for municipal and unincorporated communities capital projects.

Copies of the bill and back up material can be obtained from the Legislative Information Office in your area at the time of the hearing. If you have questions please call Rick Solie in my office at 465-3709.

LIO Directory

LIO	Location	Phone	FAX
Anchorage	3111 C. St., #150	561-7007 561-8624 (tdd)	562-4376
Barrow	Court Bldg.	852-7111	852-7114
Bethel	301 Willow St.	543-3541	543-2712
Delta Junction	Jarvis Office Cntr, # 210	895-4236	895-5017
Dillingham	Kangilqutaq Office Bldg.	842-5319	842-5105
Fairbanks	119 N. Cushman, # 101	452-4448 456-5075 (tdd)	456-3346
Glennallen	Community Library	822-5588	822-5591
Homer LTC	Hillis Bldg.	235-7878	235-4008
Juneau	224 Seward St. #210	465-4648 465-4980(tdd)	463-5661
Kenai	34824 Kalifonski Beach	262-9364	262-1881
Ketchikan	352 Front St, Suite A.	225-9675	225-8546
Kodiak	Kodiak Plaza Bldg.	486-8116	486-5264
Kotzebue	Eskimo Bldg.	442-3880	452-3022
Mat-Su	Krenik Bldg., #106	376-3704	376-6180
Nome	State Bldg., 2nd Floor	443-5555	443-2162
Petersburg	101 Gjoa St.	772-3741	772-3779
Sitka	210 Lake St.	747-6276	747-5807
Valdez	State Bldg., #13	835-2111	835-2097
Wrangell LTC	Longshoreman's Hall	874-3013	874-3955

**THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENT
HAS NOT BEEN FILMED
BUT IS AVAILABLE IN THE
ORIGINAL FILE**

ALASKA PUBLIC DEBT 1989




**State of Alaska
Department of Revenue
March 1990**

**THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENT
HAS NOT BEEN FILMED
BUT IS AVAILABLE IN THE
ORIGINAL FILE**

Alaska Taxable

1990



Municipal Taxation - Rates and Policies

Full Value Determination

Population and G.O. Bonded Debt



Volume XXX
January, 1991



State of Alaska
Walter J. Hickel, Governor

Department of Community and Regional Affairs
Edgar Blatchford, Commissioner