

**ALASKA LEGISLATURE**

**1467**

**HOUSE and SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE FILES, 1995-1996**

Amend

704

the safe communities [MUNICIPAL ASSISTANCE] fund to all municipalities must be made on <sup>[OCTOBER 31]</sup> ~~July 31~~ [FEBRUARY 1] of the state fiscal year for which the appropriation to the fund is made. A municipality that incorporates after July 1 [DECEMBER 31] of a state fiscal year is not eligible for a distribution under this section until the following state fiscal year.

\* Sec. 9. AS 29.60.350 is amended by adding new subsections to read:

(c) Money from the revenue sharing for safe communities program distributed to a municipality shall be used by that municipality only for the following services in the following ranking of priority:

- (1) police protection and related public safety services;
- (2) fire protection and emergency medical services;
- (3) water and sewer services not offset by user fees;
- (4) solid waste management;
- (5) other services determined by the governing body to have the highest

priority.

(d) Subsection (c) of this section may not be construed to require a municipality to fund all requests it receives for services in a category with a higher ranking of priority before funding services in a category with a lower ranking of priority.

\* Sec. 10. AS 29.60.360 is amended to read:

Sec. 29.60.360. BASE AMOUNT ACCOUNT DISTRIBUTIONS [OF ASSISTANCE]. (a) The base amount to be distributed from the base amount account [MUNICIPAL ASSISTANCE FUND] to each municipality for the fiscal year shall be the amount received by the municipality during fiscal year 1978 under AS 43.70.080 as that section provided before the 1978 amendment. A city incorporated within a borough after June 30, 1977, shall receive as a base amount a share of the amount distributed to the borough in which it is located based on the ratio of population in the city to the total population in the borough. A city incorporated outside a borough after June 30, 1977, shall receive as a base amount the amount received by the city in the state most closely approximating it in population at the time of its incorporation. A borough incorporated after June 30, 1977, shall receive as a base amount the amount received by the borough in the state most clearly approximating it in population at the time of its incorporation,

1 excluding each borough with a per capita full and true property value exceeding  
2 \$500,000. The base amount to be distributed to each municipality organized under  
3 federal law shall be the amount received as a base amount by the city most closely  
4 approximating it in population on June 30, 1977.

5 (b) If the amount in the base amount account from allocation of  
6 appropriations [APPROPRIATED] to the safe communities [MUNICIPAL  
7 ASSISTANCE] fund [BY THE LEGISLATURE] during a fiscal year is insufficient for  
8 distribution of the full base amount to each municipality, the department shall prorate the  
9 amount available for distribution [ON THE BASIS OF AMOUNTS RECEIVED  
10 DURING THE FISCAL YEAR 1978 UNDER AS 43.70.080].

11 \* Sec. 11. AS 29.60.370(a) is amended to read:

12 Sec. 29.60.370. PER CAPITA ACCOUNT DISTRIBUTION [INCREASED  
13 ASSISTANCE]. (a) The [IF THE] amount allocated to the per capita account in the  
14 safe communities [MUNICIPAL ASSISTANCE] fund [AT THE TIME OF  
15 DISTRIBUTION EXCEEDS THE BASE AMOUNT TO BE DISTRIBUTED UNDER  
16 AS 29.60.360, THE EXCESS AMOUNT] shall be distributed to each municipality on  
17 the basis of population. Population for the purpose of this section shall be as certified  
18 by the commissioner of community and regional affairs. In determining the population  
19 of a borough, the population of all cities in the borough shall be deducted from the total  
20 population of the borough.

21 \* Sec. 12. AS 29.60 is amended by adding new sections to read:

22 Sec. 29.60.372. MINIMUM PAYMENT. If a municipality qualifies for a  
23 payment during a fiscal year under AS 29.60.010 - 29.60.080, 29.60.100 - 29.60.180,  
24 29.60.290, or 29.60.350 and if the total amount payable to the municipality under those  
25 sections is less than \$40,000, the department shall pay to the municipality a minimum  
26 payment in an amount equal to the difference between the total amount payable under  
27 those sections and \$40,000 as adjusted under AS 29.60.373.

28 Sec. 29.60.373. ADJUSTMENT OF PAYMENTS. Adjustment of payments  
29 shall be determined by prorating amounts payable under AS 29.60.360, 29.60.370, and  
30 29.60.372 by a factor that, when applied, reduces all payments in equal proportion so  
31 that total payments equal the amount appropriated to the safe communities fund.

32 \* Sec. 13. AS 29.60.370(b) is repealed.

1 \* Sec. 14. This Act takes effect July 1, 1996.

adopted 10-1 passed

AMENDMENT I

OFFERED IN THE HOUSE

TO: C S S S S B 20(FIN)

1 Page 4, following line 2:

2 Insert a new bill section to read:

3 **\*\* Sec. 6.** AS 29.60.140(a) is amended to read:

4 (a) The department shall pay to each unincorporated community an  
5 entitlement each fiscal year to be used for a public purpose. The department with  
6 advice from the Department of Law shall determine whether there is in each  
7 unincorporated community a nonprofit corporation organized under the laws of the  
8 state [AN INCORPORATED NONPROFIT ENTITY OR A NATIVE VILLAGE  
9 COUNCIL] that will agree to receive and spend the entitlement. If there is more than  
10 one qualified nonprofit corporation [ENTITY] in an unincorporated community, the  
11 department shall pay the money under the entitlement to the nonprofit corporation  
12 [ENTITY] that the department finds most qualified to receive and spend the money.  
13 [THE DEPARTMENT MAY NOT PAY MONEY UNDER AN ENTITLEMENT TO  
14 A NATIVE VILLAGE COUNCIL UNLESS THE COUNCIL WAIVES IMMUNITY  
15 FROM SUIT FOR CLAIMS ARISING OUT OF ACTIVITIES OF THE COUNCIL  
16 RELATED TO THE ENTITLEMENT. A WAIVER OF IMMUNITY FROM SUIT  
17 UNDER THIS SUBSECTION MUST BE ON A FORM PROVIDED BY THE  
18 DEPARTMENT OF LAW.] If there is no qualified nonprofit corporation  
19 [INCORPORATED NONPROFIT ENTITY OR NATIVE VILLAGE COUNCIL] in  
20 an unincorporated community that is willing to receive money under an entitlement,  
21 the entitlement for that unincorporated community may not be paid. [NEITHER THIS  
22 SUBSECTION NOR ANY ACTION TAKEN UNDER IT ENLARGES OR  
23 DIMINISHES THE GOVERNMENTAL AUTHORITY OR JURISDICTION OF A  
24 NATIVE VILLAGE COUNCIL.] If at least \$41,472,000 is appropriated for all  
25 entitlements under AS 29.60.010 - 29.60.310 for a fiscal year, the entitlement for each

- 1       unincorporated community under this subsection for that year equals \$40,000.
- 2       Otherwise, the entitlement equals \$25,000."
  
- 3    Renumber the following bill sections accordingly.

Parnell

adopted NO/OBJ  
AMENDMENT 2

TO: CS FOR SS FOR SB 20 (FIN)

BY: PARNELL

- P. 2, ln 15 DELETE "SAFE"
- P. 3, ln 1 DELETE "SAFE"
- P. 4, ln 18 DELETE "SAFE"
- P. 4, ln 19 DELETE "safe"
- P. 4, ln 20 DELETE "safe"
- P. 4, ln 22 DELETE "safe"
- P. 4, ln 28 DELETE "safe"
- P. 5, ln 1 DELETE "safe"
- P. 5, ln 7 DELETE "safe"
- P. 6, ln 6 DELETE "safe"
- P. 6, ln 14 DELETE "safe"

Failed 4-7

~~Withdraw~~

**AMENDMENT #3**

TO: CS FOR SS FOR SB 20 (FIN)

BY: ~~PARNELL~~ Thernault

P. 5, lines 6-19      DELETE ALL MATERIAL

## Comparison of an 8 % Cut to Municipal Assistance Payments Under Existing Formula vs. "Base Amounts" Not Held Harmless

(1) Payments municipalities would receive if the FY 97 appropriation to Municipal Assistance was the same as the FY 96 appropriation

### Existing Program

- (2) Payments municipalities will receive under the existing program if the FY 97 appropriation for Municipal Assistance is 8 percent less than the FY 96 appropriation (Governor's request). The existing program funds the base amount of assistance in its entirety and takes the reduction out of increased assistance.  
 (3) Amount each municipality's allocation is reduced from it's FY 96 allocation under the existing program  
 (4) Percent reduction each municipality realizes under the existing program.

### Hold Harmless Removed

- (5) Payments municipalities would receive if FY 97 if the base amount of assistance and the increased assistance are both reduced by the same percentage as the overall appropriation reduction between FY 96 and FY 97  
 (6) Amount each municipality's allocation would be reduced from it's FY 96 allocation with the hold harmless removed.  
 (7) Percent reduction each municipality would realize.

### Relative Differences

- (8) The difference in each municipality's FY 97 allocation under the existing program and by removing the hold harmless  
 (9) The percent difference in each municipality's FY 97 allocation under the existing program and by removing the hold harmless

Comparison of an 8% Cut to Municipal Assistance Payments Under Existing Formula vs. "Base Amounts" Not Held Harmless

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Municipality	Estimated FY 97 MA Payments	MA Payments With 8% Cut	\$\$ Difference	% Difference	MA Base Amounts Not Held Harmless With 8% Cut	\$\$ Difference	% Difference	Relative \$\$ Difference	Relative % Difference
City of Akhlok	\$3,274	\$2,934	(\$340)	-10.38%	\$3,012	(\$262)	-8.00%	\$78	2.38%
City of Akiak	\$11,486	\$10,124	(\$1,362)	-11.86%	\$10,567	(\$919)	-8.00%	\$443	3.86%
City of Akutan	\$15,701	\$13,846	(\$1,855)	-11.81%	\$14,445	(\$1,256)	-8.00%	\$599	3.81%
City of Alakanuk	\$26,699	\$24,128	(\$2,571)	-9.63%	\$24,563	(\$2,136)	-8.00%	\$435	1.63%
City of Aleknagik	\$6,915	\$6,140	(\$775)	-11.21%	\$6,362	(\$553)	-8.00%	\$222	3.21%
Aleutians East Borough	\$10,875	\$10,420	(\$455)	-4.18%	\$10,005	(\$870)	-8.00%	(\$415)	-3.82%
City of Atkasket	\$5,705	\$5,037	(\$668)	-11.71%	\$5,249	(\$456)	-8.00%	\$212	3.71%
City of Ambler	\$11,594	\$10,279	(\$1,315)	-11.34%	\$10,666	(\$928)	-8.00%	\$387	3.34%
City of Anaktuvuk Pass	\$10,461	\$9,218	(\$1,243)	-11.88%	\$9,624	(\$837)	-8.00%	\$406	3.88%
Municipality of Anchorage	\$14,061,530	\$12,964,382	(\$1,097,148)	-7.80%	\$12,936,608	(\$1,124,922)	-8.00%	(\$27,774)	-0.20%
City of Anderson	\$23,558	\$20,894	(\$2,664)	-11.31%	\$21,873	(\$1,885)	-8.00%	\$779	3.31%
City of Angoon	\$24,275	\$21,718	(\$2,557)	-10.53%	\$22,333	(\$1,942)	-8.00%	\$615	2.53%
City of Aniak	\$23,853	\$21,380	(\$2,473)	-10.37%	\$21,945	(\$1,908)	-8.00%	\$565	2.37%
City of Anvik	\$3,509	\$3,100	(\$409)	-11.66%	\$3,228	(\$281)	-8.00%	\$128	3.66%
City of Aitka	\$3,544	\$3,131	(\$413)	-11.65%	\$3,260	(\$284)	-8.00%	\$129	3.65%
City of Atkasuk	\$25,563	\$24,571	(\$992)	-3.88%	\$23,518	(\$2,045)	-8.00%	(\$1,053)	-4.12%
City of Barrow	\$174,205	\$156,185	(\$18,020)	-10.34%	\$160,269	(\$13,936)	-8.00%	\$4,084	2.34%
City of Bethel	\$250,262	\$228,151	(\$22,111)	-8.84%	\$230,241	(\$20,021)	-8.00%	\$2,090	0.84%
City of Battles	\$1,722	\$1,577	(\$145)	-8.42%	\$1,584	(\$138)	-8.00%	\$7	0.42%
City of Brevig Mission	\$9,573	\$8,445	(\$1,128)	-11.78%	\$8,807	(\$766)	-8.00%	\$362	3.78%
Bristol Bay Borough	\$60,270	\$54,716	(\$5,554)	-9.22%	\$55,448	(\$4,822)	-8.00%	\$732	1.22%
City of Burdland	\$15,123	\$13,356	(\$1,767)	-11.68%	\$13,913	(\$1,210)	-8.00%	\$557	3.68%
City of Chitomak	\$13,715	\$12,136	(\$1,579)	-11.51%	\$12,618	(\$1,097)	-8.00%	\$482	3.51%
City of Chevak	\$24,430	\$21,528	(\$2,902)	-11.88%	\$22,476	(\$1,954)	-8.00%	\$948	3.88%
City of Chignik	\$5,330	\$4,730	(\$600)	-11.26%	\$4,904	(\$426)	-8.00%	\$174	3.26%
City of Chuathbaluk	\$4,782	\$4,230	(\$552)	-11.17%	\$4,381	(\$381)	-8.00%	\$151	3.17%
City of Coffman Cove	\$9,117	\$8,035	(\$1,082)	-11.87%	\$8,368	(\$729)	-8.00%	\$353	3.87%
City of Cold Bay	\$11,910	\$10,973	(\$937)	-7.87%	\$10,957	(\$953)	-8.00%	(\$16)	-0.13%
City of Cordova	\$136,334	\$125,405	(\$10,929)	-8.02%	\$125,427	(\$10,907)	-8.00%	\$22	0.02%
City of Craig	\$74,023	\$65,741	(\$8,282)	-11.19%	\$68,101	(\$5,922)	-8.00%	\$2,360	3.19%
City of Deering	\$5,893	\$5,242	(\$651)	-11.05%	\$5,422	(\$471)	-8.00%	\$180	3.05%
City of Delta Junction	\$58,653	\$55,129	(\$3,524)	-6.01%	\$53,961	(\$4,692)	-8.00%	(\$1,168)	-1.98%
Denali Borough	\$61,724	\$55,995	(\$5,729)	-9.28%	\$56,786	(\$4,938)	-8.00%	\$791	1.28%
City of Dillingham	\$106,735	\$97,188	(\$9,547)	-8.94%	\$88,108	(\$18,539)	-8.00%	\$1,008	0.94%
City of Dolomite	\$5,552	\$4,896	(\$656)	-11.82%	\$5,108	(\$444)	-8.00%	\$212	3.82%
City of Eagle	\$6,012	\$5,391	(\$621)	-10.33%	\$5,531	(\$481)	-8.00%	\$140	2.33%

## Comparison of an 8 % Cut to Municipal Assistance Payments Under Existing Formula vs. "Base Amounts" Not Held Harmless

(1) Payments municipalities would receive if the FY 97 appropriation to Municipal Assistance was the same as the FY 96 appropriation

### Existing Program

- (2) Payments municipalities will receive under the existing program if the FY 97 appropriation for Municipal Assistance is 8 percent less than the FY 96 appropriation (Governor's request). The existing program funds the base amount of assistance in its entirety and takes the reduction out of increased assistance.  
 (3) Amount each municipality's allocation is reduced from it's FY 96 allocation under the existing program  
 (4) Percent reduction each municipality realizes under the existing program.

### Hold Harmless Removed

- (5) Payments municipalities would receive if FY 97 if the base amount of assistance and the increased assistance are both reduced by the same percentage as the overall appropriation reduction between FY 96 and FY 97  
 (6) Amount each municipality's allocation would be reduced from it's FY 96 allocation with the hold harmless removed.  
 (7) Percent reduction each municipality would realize.

### Relative Differences

- (8) The difference in each municipality's FY 97 allocation under the existing program and by removing the hold harmless  
 (9) The percent difference in each municipality's FY 97 allocation under the existing program and by removing the hold harmless

Comparison of an 8% Cut to Municipal Assistance Payments Under Existing Formula vs. "Base Amounts" Not Held Harmless

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Municipality	Estimated FY 97 MA Payments	MA Payments With 8% Cut	\$\$ Difference	% Difference	MA Base Amounts Not Held Harmless With 8% Cut	\$\$ Difference	% Difference	Relative \$\$ Difference	Relative % Difference
City of Eek	\$10,321	\$9,117	(\$1,204)	-11.87%	\$9,495	(\$826)	-8.00%	\$378	3.67%
City of Ekwok	\$3,686	\$3,261	(\$435)	-11.77%	\$3,400	(\$296)	-8.00%	\$139	3.77%
City of Elim	\$10,327	\$9,131	(\$1,196)	-11.58%	\$9,501	(\$826)	-8.00%	\$370	3.58%
City of Emmonak	\$30,118	\$26,874	(\$3,244)	-10.77%	\$27,709	(\$2,409)	-8.00%	\$835	2.77%
City of Fairbanks	\$2,205,959	\$2,066,975	(\$138,984)	-6.30%	\$2,029,482	(\$176,477)	-8.00%	(\$37,493)	-1.70%
Fairbanks NSB	\$2,342,757	\$2,129,627	(\$213,130)	-9.10%	\$2,155,336	(\$187,421)	-8.00%	\$25,709	1.10%
City of False Pass	\$3,281	\$2,910	(\$371)	-11.31%	\$3,019	(\$262)	-8.00%	\$109	3.31%
City of Fort Yukon	\$30,228	\$27,407	(\$2,821)	-9.33%	\$27,810	(\$2,418)	-8.00%	\$403	1.33%
City of Galena	\$25,837	\$23,394	(\$2,443)	-8.75%	\$23,586	(\$2,051)	-8.00%	\$192	0.75%
City of Gambell	\$23,705	\$21,032	(\$2,673)	-11.28%	\$21,809	(\$1,896)	-8.00%	\$777	3.28%
City of Golovin	\$6,177	\$5,513	(\$664)	-10.75%	\$5,683	(\$494)	-8.00%	\$170	2.75%
City of Goodnews Bay	\$9,074	\$7,992	(\$1,082)	-11.92%	\$8,348	(\$726)	-8.00%	\$356	3.92%
City of Grayling	\$7,923	\$7,021	(\$902)	-11.38%	\$7,289	(\$634)	-8.00%	\$268	3.38%
City of Haines	\$69,505	\$63,572	(\$5,933)	-8.54%	\$63,945	(\$5,560)	-8.00%	\$373	0.54%
Haines Borough	\$40,862	\$36,831	(\$4,031)	-9.86%	\$37,593	(\$3,269)	-8.00%	\$762	1.86%
City of Holy Cross	\$11,134	\$9,904	(\$1,230)	-11.05%	\$10,243	(\$891)	-8.00%	\$339	3.05%
City of Homer	\$208,828	\$191,037	(\$17,791)	-8.43%	\$191,938	(\$16,690)	-8.00%	\$901	0.43%
City of Hoonah	\$39,032	\$35,189	(\$3,843)	-9.85%	\$35,909	(\$3,123)	-8.00%	\$720	1.85%
City of Hooper Bay	\$37,788	\$33,549	(\$4,239)	-11.22%	\$34,765	(\$3,023)	-8.00%	\$1,216	3.22%
City of Houston	\$35,559	\$31,490	(\$4,069)	-11.44%	\$32,714	(\$2,845)	-8.00%	\$1,224	3.44%
City of Hughes	\$2,847	\$2,515	(\$332)	-11.66%	\$2,819	(\$28)	-8.00%	\$104	3.66%
City of Huslia	\$9,696	\$8,611	(\$1,085)	-11.19%	\$8,920	(\$776)	-8.00%	\$309	3.19%
City of Hydaburg	\$18,303	\$14,575	(\$3,728)	-10.60%	\$14,989	(\$1,304)	-8.00%	\$424	2.60%
City & Borough of Juneau	\$1,427,669	\$1,301,027	(\$126,642)	-8.87%	\$1,313,455	(\$114,214)	-8.00%	\$12,428	0.87%
City of Kachemak	\$14,820	\$13,100	(\$1,720)	-11.61%	\$13,634	(\$1,186)	-6.00%	\$534	3.61%
City of Kake	\$27,142	\$24,180	(\$2,962)	-10.91%	\$24,971	(\$2,171)	-8.00%	\$791	2.91%
City of Kaktovik	\$8,533	\$7,639	(\$894)	-10.48%	\$7,850	(\$683)	-8.00%	\$211	2.48%
City of Kaltag	\$9,115	\$8,021	(\$1,094)	-12.00%	\$8,388	(\$729)	-8.00%	\$365	4.00%
City of Kasaan	\$1,484	\$1,310	(\$174)	-11.73%	\$1,195	(\$119)	-8.00%	\$55	3.73%
City of Kenai	\$394,445	\$364,828	(\$29,619)	-7.56%	\$362,889	(\$31,556)	-8.00%	(\$1,737)	-0.44%
Kenai Peninsula Borough	\$1,347,372	\$1,227,349	(\$120,023)	-8.91%	\$1,239,582	(\$107,790)	-8.00%	\$12,233	0.91%
City of Ketchikan	\$512,408	\$475,988	(\$36,420)	-7.11%	\$471,415	(\$40,993)	-8.00%	(\$4,573)	-0.89%
Ketchikan Gateway Borough	\$249,773	\$223,712	(\$26,061)	-10.43%	\$228,781	(\$19,982)	-8.00%	\$6,079	2.43%
City of Klana	\$16,145	\$14,370	(\$1,775)	-10.99%	\$14,853	(\$1,292)	-8.00%	\$483	2.99%
City of King Cove	\$33,019	\$29,278	(\$3,741)	-11.33%	\$30,377	(\$2,642)	-8.00%	\$1,099	3.33%
City of Kivalina	\$12,538	\$11,052	(\$1,486)	-11.85%	\$11,535	(\$1,003)	-8.00%	\$483	3.85%

## Comparison of an 8 % Cut to Municipal Assistance Payments Under Existing Formula vs. "Base Amounts" Not Held Harmless

(1) Payments municipalities would receive if the FY 97 appropriation to Municipal Assistance was the same as the FY 96 appropriation

### Existing Program

- (2) Payments municipalities will receive under the existing program if the FY 97 appropriation for Municipal Assistance is 8 percent less than the FY 96 appropriation (Governor's request). The existing program funds the base amount of assistance in its entirety and takes the reduction out of increased assistance.  
 (3) Amount each municipality's allocation is reduced from its FY 96 allocation under the existing program  
 (4) Percent reduction each municipality realizes under the existing program.

### Hold Harmless Removed

- (5) Payments municipalities would receive if FY 97 if the base amount of assistance and the increased assistance are both reduced by the same percentage as the overall appropriation reduction between FY 96 and FY 97  
 (6) Amount each municipality's allocation would be reduced from its FY 96 allocation with the hold harmless removed.  
 (7) Percent reduction each municipality would realize.

### Relative Differences

- (8) The difference in each municipality's FY 97 allocation under the existing program and by removing the hold harmless  
 (9) The percent difference in each municipality's FY 97 allocation under the existing program and by removing the hold harmless

Comparison of an 8% Cut to Municipal Assistance Payments Under Existing Formula vs. "Base Amounts" Not Held Harmless									
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	
Municipality	Estimated FY 97 MA Payments	MA Payments With 8% Cut	\$\$ Difference	% Difference	MA Base Amounts Not Held Harmless With 8% Cut	\$\$ Difference	% Difference	Relative \$\$ Difference	Relative % Difference
City of Klawock	\$28,459	\$25,229	(\$3,230)	-11.35%	\$26,182	(\$2,277)	-8.00%	\$953	3.35%
City of Kobuk	\$2,873	\$2,533	(\$340)	-11.83%	\$2,643	(\$230)	-8.00%	\$110	3.83%
City of Kodiak	\$432,770	\$400,338	(\$32,432)	-7.49%	\$398,148	(\$34,622)	-8.00%	(\$2,190)	-0.51%
Kodiak Island Borough	\$259,790	\$231,112	(\$28,678)	-11.04%	\$239,007	(\$20,783)	-8.00%	\$7,895	3.04%
City of Kotlik	\$20,532	\$18,199	(\$2,333)	-11.36%	\$18,889	(\$1,643)	-8.00%	\$690	3.36%
City of Kotzebue	\$138,465	\$125,923	(\$12,542)	-9.06%	\$127,388	(\$11,077)	-8.00%	\$1,465	1.06%
City of Koyuk	\$10,150	\$8,963	(\$1,187)	-11.69%	\$9,338	(\$812)	-8.00%	\$375	3.69%
City of Koyukuk	\$4,878	\$4,346	(\$532)	-10.91%	\$4,488	(\$390)	-8.00%	\$142	2.91%
City of Kupreanof	\$851	\$749	(\$102)	-11.99%	\$783	(\$68)	-8.00%	\$34	3.99%
City of Kwethluk	\$25,817	\$22,889	(\$2,928)	-11.34%	\$23,752	(\$2,065)	-8.00%	\$863	3.34%
Lake and Peninsula Borough	\$45,558	\$41,608	(\$3,950)	-8.67%	\$41,913	(\$3,645)	-8.00%	\$305	0.57%
City of Larsen Bay	\$4,611	\$4,057	(\$554)	-12.01%	\$4,242	(\$369)	-8.00%	\$185	4.01%
City of Lower Kalskag	\$11,132	\$9,821	(\$1,311)	-11.78%	\$10,241	(\$891)	-8.00%	\$420	3.78%
City of Manokotak	\$14,577	\$12,868	(\$1,711)	-11.74%	\$13,411	(\$1,166)	-8.00%	\$545	3.74%
City of Marshall	\$11,092	\$9,824	(\$1,268)	-11.43%	\$10,205	(\$887)	-8.00%	\$381	3.43%
Mat-Su Borough	\$1,540,307	\$1,366,362	(\$173,945)	-11.29%	\$1,417,082	(\$123,225)	-8.00%	\$50,720	3.29%
City of McGrath	\$20,339	\$18,300	(\$2,039)	-10.03%	\$18,712	(\$1,627)	-8.00%	\$412	2.03%
City of Mekoryuk	\$7,754	\$6,852	(\$902)	-11.63%	\$7,134	(\$620)	-8.00%	\$282	3.63%
City of Mountain Village	\$29,197	\$25,971	(\$3,226)	-11.05%	\$26,861	(\$2,336)	-8.00%	\$890	3.05%
City of Napakiak	\$13,109	\$11,722	(\$1,387)	-10.58%	\$12,060	(\$1,049)	-8.00%	\$338	2.58%
City of Napaskiak	\$14,344	\$12,624	(\$1,720)	-11.99%	\$13,198	(\$1,146)	-8.00%	\$572	3.99%
City of Nenana	\$29,914	\$27,828	(\$2,086)	-6.97%	\$27,521	(\$2,393)	-8.00%	(\$307)	-1.03%
City of New Stuyahok	\$15,310	\$13,519	(\$1,791)	-11.70%	\$14,085	(\$1,225)	-8.00%	\$566	3.70%
City of Newhalen	\$6,240	\$5,517	(\$723)	-11.59%	\$5,741	(\$499)	-8.00%	\$224	3.59%
City of Nightmute	\$8,723	\$5,919	(\$2,804)	-11.96%	\$6,185	(\$2,538)	-8.00%	\$266	3.96%
City of Nikolai	\$4,448	\$3,916	(\$532)	-11.96%	\$4,092	(\$356)	-8.00%	\$176	3.96%
City of Nome	\$194,363	\$177,407	(\$16,956)	-8.72%	\$178,814	(\$15,549)	-8.00%	\$1,407	0.72%
City of Nondalton	\$8,833	\$7,824	(\$1,009)	-11.42%	\$8,126	(\$707)	-8.00%	\$302	3.42%
City of Noonvik	\$22,187	\$19,693	(\$2,494)	-11.24%	\$20,412	(\$1,775)	-8.00%	\$719	3.24%
City of North Pole	\$89,827	\$82,808	(\$7,019)	-7.81%	\$82,641	(\$7,186)	-8.00%	(\$167)	-0.19%
North Slope Borough	\$1,284,770	\$1,283,832	(\$938)	-0.04%	\$1,181,188	(\$103,582)	-8.00%	(\$92,644)	-7.16%
Northwest Arctic Borough	\$26,711	\$24,378	(\$2,333)	-8.73%	\$24,574	(\$2,137)	-8.00%	\$196	0.73%
City of Nulakti	\$14,571	\$12,828	(\$1,743)	-11.98%	\$13,405	(\$1,166)	-8.00%	\$579	3.98%
City of Nulato	\$13,382	\$11,854	(\$1,528)	-11.42%	\$12,311	(\$1,071)	-8.00%	\$457	3.42%
City of Nunapituk	\$16,486	\$14,545	(\$1,941)	-11.77%	\$15,167	(\$1,319)	-8.00%	\$622	3.77%
City of Old Harbor	\$11,348	\$10,028	(\$1,320)	-11.63%	\$10,440	(\$908)	-8.00%	\$412	3.63%

## Comparison of an 8 % Cut to Municipal Assistance Payments Under Existing Formula vs. "Base Amounts" Not Held Harmless

(1) Payments municipalities would receive if the FY 97 appropriation to Municipal Assistance was the same as the FY 96 appropriation

### Existing Program

- (2) Payments municipalities will receive under the existing program if the FY 97 appropriation for Municipal Assistance is 8 percent less than the FY 96 appropriation (Governor's request). The existing program funds the base amount of assistance in its entirety and takes the reduction out of increased assistance.  
 (3) Amount each municipality's allocation is reduced from its FY 96 allocation under the existing program  
 (4) Percent reduction each municipality realizes under the existing program.

### Hold Harmless Removed

- (5) Payments municipalities would receive if FY 97 if the base amount of assistance and the increased assistance are both reduced by the same percentage as the overall appropriation reduction between FY 96 and FY 97  
 (6) Amount each municipality's allocation would be reduced from its FY 96 allocation with the hold harmless removed.  
 (7) Percent reduction each municipality would realize.

### Relative Differences

- (8) The difference in each municipality's FY 97 allocation under the existing program and by removing the hold harmless  
 (9) The percent difference in each municipality's FY 97 allocation under the existing program and by removing the hold harmless

Comparison of an 8% Cut to Municipal Assistance Payments Under Existing Formula vs. "Base Amounts" Not Held Harmless

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Municipality	Estimated FY 97 MA Payments	MA Payments With 8% Cut	\$\$ Difference	% Difference	MA Base Amounts Not Held Harmless With 8% Cut	\$\$ Difference	% Difference	Relative \$\$ Difference	Relative % Difference
City of Ouzinkie	\$9,517	\$8,415	(\$1,102)	-11.58%	\$8,756	(\$761)	-8.00%	\$341	3.58%
City of Palmer	\$200,907	\$183,282	(\$17,625)	-8.77%	\$184,834	(\$16,073)	-8.00%	\$1,552	0.77%
City of Pelican	\$10,318	\$9,428	(\$890)	-8.63%	\$9,493	(\$825)	-8.00%	\$65	0.63%
City of Petersburg	\$162,462	\$148,204	(\$14,258)	-8.78%	\$149,465	(\$12,997)	-8.00%	\$1,261	0.78%
City of Pilot Point	\$3,778	\$3,378	(\$400)	-10.59%	\$3,478	(\$302)	-8.00%	\$98	2.59%
City of Pilot Station	\$18,825	\$16,599	(\$2,226)	-11.82%	\$17,319	(\$1,506)	-8.00%	\$720	3.82%
City of Platinum	\$2,077	\$1,889	(\$188)	-9.05%	\$1,911	(\$166)	-8.00%	\$22	1.05%
City of Point Hope	\$29,098	\$26,021	(\$3,077)	-10.57%	\$26,770	(\$2,328)	-8.00%	\$749	2.57%
City of Port Alexander	\$4,194	\$3,726	(\$468)	-11.16%	\$3,858	(\$336)	-8.00%	\$132	3.16%
City of Port Heiden	\$4,707	\$4,171	(\$536)	-11.39%	\$4,330	(\$377)	-8.00%	\$159	3.39%
City of Port Lions	\$9,861	\$8,541	(\$1,120)	-11.59%	\$8,888	(\$773)	-8.00%	\$347	3.59%
City of Quinhagak	\$20,164	\$17,828	(\$2,336)	-11.59%	\$18,551	(\$1,613)	-8.00%	\$723	3.59%
City of Ruby	\$8,215	\$7,321	(\$894)	-10.88%	\$7,558	(\$657)	-8.00%	\$237	2.88%
City of Russian Mission	\$10,508	\$9,252	(\$1,256)	-11.95%	\$9,667	(\$841)	-8.00%	\$415	3.95%
City of Sand Point	\$39,522	\$35,312	(\$4,210)	-10.85%	\$36,360	(\$3,162)	-8.00%	\$1,048	2.65%
City of Savoonga	\$23,783	\$21,192	(\$2,571)	-10.82%	\$21,882	(\$1,901)	-8.00%	\$670	2.82%
City of Saxman	\$15,385	\$13,674	(\$1,711)	-11.12%	\$14,154	(\$1,231)	-8.00%	\$480	3.12%
City of Scammon Bay	\$15,945	\$14,097	(\$1,848)	-11.59%	\$14,669	(\$1,276)	-8.00%	\$572	3.59%
City of Selawik	\$24,034	\$21,276	(\$2,758)	-11.48%	\$22,111	(\$1,923)	-8.00%	\$835	3.48%
City of Seldovia	\$17,303	\$15,881	(\$1,422)	-8.22%	\$15,919	(\$1,384)	-8.00%	\$38	0.22%
City of Seward	\$153,240	\$140,327	(\$12,913)	-8.43%	\$140,981	(\$12,259)	-8.00%	\$654	0.43%
City of Shageluk	\$5,278	\$4,863	(\$413)	-11.62%	\$4,854	(\$422)	-8.00%	\$191	3.62%
City of Shaktolik	\$7,188	\$6,319	(\$867)	-11.82%	\$6,593	(\$573)	-8.00%	\$274	3.82%
City of Sheldon Point	\$5,895	\$5,201	(\$694)	-11.77%	\$5,423	(\$472)	-8.00%	\$222	3.77%
City of Shishmaref	\$19,980	\$17,889	(\$2,091)	-11.42%	\$18,382	(\$1,598)	-8.00%	\$683	3.42%
City of Shungnak	\$9,819	\$8,709	(\$1,030)	-10.49%	\$9,033	(\$786)	-8.00%	\$244	2.49%
City and Borough of Sitka	\$457,721	\$418,590	(\$39,131)	-8.55%	\$421,103	(\$36,618)	-8.00%	\$2,513	0.55%
City of Skagway	\$50,343	\$46,882	(\$3,451)	-6.85%	\$46,318	(\$4,027)	-8.00%	(\$576)	-1.15%
City of Soldotna	\$244,536	\$227,554	(\$16,982)	-6.94%	\$224,973	(\$19,563)	-8.00%	(\$2,581)	-1.06%
City of St. George	\$7,053	\$6,223	(\$830)	-11.77%	\$6,489	(\$564)	-8.00%	\$266	3.77%
City of St. Mary's	\$17,608	\$15,587	(\$2,021)	-11.58%	\$16,198	(\$1,408)	-8.00%	\$631	3.58%
City of St. Michael	\$16,201	\$14,750	(\$1,451)	-9.96%	\$14,905	(\$1,296)	-8.00%	\$155	0.96%
City of St. Paul	\$27,707	\$24,442	(\$3,265)	-11.76%	\$25,490	(\$2,217)	-8.00%	\$1,048	3.78%
City of Stebbins	\$17,164	\$15,142	(\$2,022)	-11.78%	\$15,791	(\$1,373)	-8.00%	\$649	3.78%
City of Tanana	\$14,898	\$13,204	(\$1,694)	-10.16%	\$13,522	(\$1,176)	-8.00%	\$318	2.16%
City of Teller	\$9,850	\$8,724	(\$1,126)	-11.79%	\$9,099	(\$791)	-8.00%	\$375	3.79%

## Comparison of an 8 % Cut to Municipal Assistance Payments Under Existing Formula vs. "Base Amounts" Not Held Harmless

(1) Payments municipalities would receive if the FY 97 appropriation to Municipal Assistance was the same as the FY 96 appropriation

### Existing Program

- (2) Payments municipalities will receive under the existing program if the FY 97 appropriation for Municipal Assistance is 8 percent less than the FY 96 appropriation (Governor's request). The existing program funds the base amount of assistance in its entirety and takes the reduction out of increased assistance.  
 (3) Amount each municipality's allocation is reduced from its FY 96 allocation under the existing program  
 (4) Percent reduction each municipality realizes under the existing program.

### Hold Harmless Removed

- (5) Payments municipalities would receive if FY 97 if the base amount of assistance and the increased assistance are both reduced by the same percentage as the overall appropriation reduction between FY 96 and FY 97  
 (6) Amount each municipality's allocation would be reduced from its FY 96 allocation with the hold harmless removed.  
 (7) Percent reduction each municipality would realize.

### Relative Differences

- (8) The difference in each municipality's FY 97 allocation under the existing program and by removing the hold harmless  
 (9) The percent difference in each municipality's FY 97 allocation under the existing program and by removing the hold harmless

Comparison of an 8% Cut to Municipal Assistance Payments Under Existing Formula vs. "Base Amounts" Not Held Harmless

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Municipality	Estimated FY 97 MA Payments	MA Payments With 8% Cut	\$\$ Difference	% Difference	MA Base Amounts Not Held Harmless With 8% Cut	\$\$ Difference	% Difference	Relative \$\$ Difference	Relative % Difference
City of Tenakee Springs	\$5,331	\$4,858	(\$473)	-8.87%	\$4,905	(\$426)	-8.00%	\$47	0.87%
City of Thome Bay	\$24,180	\$21,414	(\$2,766)	-11.44%	\$22,246	(\$1,934)	-8.00%	\$832	3.44%
City of Togiak	\$29,521	\$26,350	(\$3,171)	-10.74%	\$27,159	(\$2,362)	-8.00%	\$809	2.74%
City of Toksook Bay	\$19,346	\$17,132	(\$2,214)	-11.44%	\$17,798	(\$1,548)	-8.00%	\$666	3.44%
City of Unalakleet	\$31,196	\$27,944	(\$3,252)	-10.42%	\$28,700	(\$2,496)	-8.00%	\$756	2.42%
City of Unalaska	\$152,307	\$134,929	(\$17,378)	-11.41%	\$140,122	(\$12,185)	-8.00%	\$5,193	3.41%
City of Upper Kalskag	\$7,804	\$7,021	(\$783)	-10.03%	\$7,180	(\$624)	-8.00%	\$159	2.03%
City of Valdez	\$526,718	\$507,697	(\$19,021)	-3.61%	\$484,581	(\$42,137)	-8.00%	(\$23,116)	-4.39%
City of Wainwright	\$19,655	\$17,344	(\$2,311)	-11.76%	\$18,083	(\$1,572)	-8.00%	\$739	3.76%
City of Wales	\$8,137	\$5,400	(\$2,737)	-12.01%	\$5,646	(\$491)	-8.00%	\$246	4.01%
City of Wasilla	\$218,923	\$199,196	(\$19,727)	-9.01%	\$201,409	(\$17,514)	-8.00%	\$2,213	1.01%
City of White Mountain	\$7,443	\$6,553	(\$890)	-11.96%	\$6,848	(\$595)	-8.00%	\$295	3.96%
City of Whittier	\$11,707	\$10,498	(\$1,209)	-10.33%	\$10,770	(\$937)	-8.00%	\$272	2.33%
City of Wrangell	\$136,653	\$124,915	(\$11,738)	-8.59%	\$125,721	(\$10,932)	-8.00%	\$806	0.59%
City and Borough of Yakutat	\$42,395	\$38,986	(\$3,409)	-8.04%	\$39,003	(\$3,392)	-8.00%	\$17	0.04%

4/24/96 aw

◊◊◊ NATIVE AMERICAN RIGHTS FUND ◊◊◊

**MEMBER ALERT**

TO: NARF Members

FROM: John Echohawk, Executive Director  
Native American Rights Fund

DATE: January 1996

SUBJECT: LEGAL BATTLE TO SAVE ALASKA NATIVE RIGHTS

I am writing immediately, because I knew you'd be concerned. The U.S. District Court of Alaska has handed down a devastating ruling that spells disaster for Alaska's 225 Native Villages.

In a decision that defies logic, the Court stripped Alaska Natives of nearly all their governmental powers. The Court ignored legal precedent -- including court decisions affirming the governmental powers of tribes in the Lower 48 states -- and essentially created an underclass of Native Americans.

The decision is blatantly wrong and NARF must appeal it.

I am writing today because I urgently need your support to fight this battle. It's a battle we must win. The future of Alaska's 85,000 Natives hinges on the outcome.

To give you an idea of what happened, I need to go back a bit. For eight years, NARF represented the Village of Venetie, fighting for their right to tax a company building a school on tribal land.

Like every other self-governing town, county and city in the U.S., Venetie wants to levy taxes to generate income to provide services their people need. But the minute Venetie tried to levy a tax, the State told the construction company not to pay. Essentially, the State said "tribes can't tax because in Alaska, tribes don't exist!"

That was when NARF went to Court to prove that Venetie is a tribe. Eight years and hundreds of thousands of dollars later, the U.S. District Court finally admitted that Native Alaskan Villages like Venetie are tribes.

Which means they can tax, right?

Wrong. Because the same court that reluctantly said the Village was a tribe turned around and revoked its basic tribal powers by saying the tribe's land is not what is known as "Indian Country." Without Indian Country status, a tribe has virtually no significant governmental powers.

Without Indian Country status, a tribe cannot tax or zone or even enforce its tribal laws intended to protect the health and safety of the community. No power to control alcohol or drugs. No way to enforce laws against assault, larceny or disturbing the peace. In short, no power to maintain peace and civility in the community.

The upshot? Our earlier victory that proved Venetie is a tribe is a hollow victory -- a cruel hoax that reduces Native Villages to nothing more than "social clubs," precisely as the State wishes.

What exactly does this ruling mean for the people of Venetie? To understand, you need to picture how and where they live.

The tribal Village of Venetie is north of the Arctic Circle -- an isolated dot on the map without roads or train tracks linking it to more populated areas. Life in Venetie is often a struggle against a hostile climate, and as you might imagine, the villagers are very independent. They subsist primarily by hunting and fishing -- as their ancestors did for hundreds of years before them.

And, like their ancestors, they govern themselves. Their tribal government makes and enforces laws to regulate hunting, fishing, and environmental concerns; provides police and fire protection;

prohibits alcohol; and provides other public services such as the small airport which is a vital link to the outside world.

But this recent U.S. District Court decision changes everything. Deprived of the power to tax, the people of Venetie won't be able to undertake urgent projects. Venetie was counting on tax revenue to build sewer facilities and bring clean water and indoor plumbing to Village homes. They need tax income to buy the fuel that runs their generators -- a major expense because it must be brought in by airplane.

Even worse than these hardships, this awful decision renders the people of Venetie helpless in a way they have never known before. Without Indian Country status, Venetie has no way to enforce their laws or keep peace in their own Village. If a non-Native is drunk and disorderly, assaults a villager, or commits some other crime, all the tribe can now do is try to enlist the help of the nearest state trooper 150 miles away in Fort Yukon!

This is intolerable -- especially for a proud, independent people. NARF must fight this misguided decision and prevail.

We must show that this recent decision is riddled with errors -- and believe me, it is. We must prove that it contradicts itself -- and I assure you, it does.

And, we must prove that in its zeal to find that Indian Country does not exist, the Court applied the wrong legal test -- which is absolutely the case.

Even with the truth of the law on our side -- we face an enormous battle and enormous costs.

To appeal, NARF must prepare exhaustive briefs that show how the U.S. District Court wrongly interpreted prior rulings -- and how it ignored Congress' assumption that Alaska tribes possessed Indian Country status in the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1971.

Your emergency gift will also support our work with other Indian groups and with tribes in the Lower 48 to enlist their help in filing amicus briefs. The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, where we will appeal, needs to know that many others are alarmed that Alaska Natives have been stripped of most all governmental powers.

Travel will also be a major cost in this case. The Ninth Circuit sits in San Francisco. And unavoidably, there will be many trips from our NARF office in Anchorage to Venetie and to San Francisco.

So I urge you, please make your emergency gift as generous as you possibly can and send it right away.

And remember, NARF is fighting for the rights of every single one of Alaska's 225 Native Villages. Because if Venetie doesn't have Indian Country status, then no Native Village does. All of them will have tribal status ...

But none of them will have the critical powers of self-government. And Alaska Natives -- by cruel comparison to tribes in the Lower 48 -- will continue to be second-class Native Americans.

There is not a moment to lose. In the weeks immediately ahead, we must file our brief. We argue it this summer. And by fall, we expect a decision -- the decision that will determine the fate of Alaska Natives.

Please help us win this battle. The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals is truly the court of last resort for Alaska's 225 Native Villages. Sometimes NARF can turn to Congress to right a wrong, but right now, Alaska's congressional delegation is so hostile to tribal rights that winning in the legislative arena would be virtually impossible.

We must win in the Court of Appeals -- or not at all.

For Alaska's Natives, it's now or never. Please support this effort as generously and wholeheartedly as you can. Thank you.

**Overview**  
**State Revenue Sharing/Municipal Assistance vs.**  
**Safe Communities Program**

***CURRENT PROGRAMS***

Municipal Assistance		State Revenue Sharing	
<b><u>Base Distribution</u></b>	<b><u>Per Capita Distribution</u></b>	<b><u>Primary Allocation</u></b>	<b><u>Separate Entitlements</u></b>
1978 Business Tax as a base  (about \$10 million "hold harmless" is distributed off the top)	Per capita distribution of the balance among all communities	$\frac{\text{All local revenue}}{\text{Community tax base} \times \text{Population}}$ (\$25,000 minimum entitlement)	1. Roads 2. Hospitals/health facilities 3. Unincorporated cities (not in boroughs) 4. Vol. fire departments (not in boroughs)

Distributed annually on February 1st

Distributed annually on July 31st

***NEW PROPOSAL - SB 20 - SAFE COMMUNITIES***

Safe Communities Program	Priority Revenue Sharing Program
All Safe Communities money must be used in the following order of priority: 1. Police protection 2. Fire protection & EMS 3. Water & Sewer 4. Solid Waste Mgmt 5. Other services	Same provisions as <b>State Revenue Sharing</b> above

**Consolidated Provisions**

1. \$40,000 minimum entitlement for the total of both programs (may be prorated if funding is reduced after FY 97).
2. Date of distribution for both programs adjusted to July 31 (Municipal Assistance is currently distributed on February 1).
3. "Hold harmless" provision removed.

**Effects of CSSSSB20 (CRA) on FY 97 SRS/MA Payments**  
(Based upon Governor's Budget; No base amount held harmless, \$40,000 overall minimum entitlement)  
**Explanation of Columns**

**Existing Program**

- (1) Payments municipalities will receive from revenue sharing under the FY 97 budget request
- (2) Payments municipalities will receive from municipal assistance under the FY 97 budget request
- (3) Total payments municipalities will receive from the two programs under the FY 97 budget request.

**CSSSSB 20 (CRA)**

**Hold Harmless**

- (4) Payments municipalities will receive from revenue sharing under the FY 97 budget request (no change from existing program shown on column 1)
- (5) Payment municipalities will receive from the Safe Communities Fund with the hold harmless provision of the base amount removed (may be compared with column 2)
- (6) Total payments municipalities would receive from the two programs if only the hold harmless provision were enacted (may be compared with column 3)
- (7) Percent difference in what would be received under CSSSSB 20 (CRA) and existing program if only the hold harmless provision were enacted

**Minimum Entitlement**

- (8) Additional funds needed for each community to receive a minimum of \$40,000. This amounts to \$238,909 or .45 percent of the total appropriation request of \$53.6 million
- (9) Additional funds that would actually be received after pro rating
- (10) Amount municipalities receive from the Safe Communities Fund after proration is made to make up the \$238,909 needed for minimum entitlements (may be compared with column 5)
- (11) Actual payment municipalities would receive from the Safe Communities Funds (may be compared to Columns 2 and 5)

**CSSSSB20(CRA) in its Entirety**

- (12) Total payments municipalities will receive from both revenue sharing and safe communities fund (may be compared to Columns 3 and 6)
- (13) Percent difference in what would be received under CSSSSB 20 (CRA) and existing program (may be compared with column 7).

**Potential Interest**

- (14) Amount of interest that could be earned because of the earlier payout of Safe Communities funds at 5 percent
- (15) Total amount received by municipalities from revenue sharing, safe communities and earned interest
- (16) Percent difference in what would be received under CSSSSB 20 (CRA) with interest and the existing program.

# CORRECTION

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



Rev. 6 98

Central Microfilm Services  
Department of Education  
State of Alaska

**Overview**  
**State Revenue Sharing/Municipal Assistance vs.**  
**Safe Communities Program**

***CURRENT PROGRAMS***

Municipal Assistance		State Revenue Sharing	
<b><u>Base Distribution</u></b>	<b><u>Per Capita Distribution</u></b>	<b><u>Primary Allocation</u></b>	<b><u>Separate Entitlements</u></b>
1978 Business Tax as a base  (about \$10 million "hold harmless" is distributed off the top)	Per capita distribution of the balance among all communities	All local revenue Community tax base X Population  (\$25,000 minimum entitlement)	1. Roads 2. Hospitals/health facilities 3. Unincorporated cities (not in boroughs) 4. Vol. fire departments (not in boroughs)

Distributed annually on February 1st

Distributed annually on July 31st

***NEW PROPOSAL - SB 20 - SAFE COMMUNITIES***

Safe Communities Program	Priority Revenue Sharing Program
All Safe Communities money must be used in the following order of priority: 1. Police protection 2. Fire protection & EMS 3. Water & Sewer 4. Solid Waste Mgmt 5. Other services	Same provisions as State Revenue Sharing above

**Consolidated Provisions**

1. \$40,000 minimum entitlement for the total of both programs (may be prorated if funding is reduced after FY 97).
2. Date of distribution for both programs adjusted to July 31 (Municipal Assistance is currently distributed on February 1).
3. "Hold harmless" provision removed.

## WHAT ARE THE FOUR "LEGS" OF SB 20 "SAFE COMMUNITIES" BILL?

1. Requires that the funds received under this program (the old Municipal Assistance Program) be used for **public safety/health basic services**. Changes program to "Safe Communities".
2. Creates a new **\$40,000 minimum** payment for small incorporated municipalities. (Larger communities contribute about \$238,000 of their allocation to raise minimums for small communities. Anchorage, Fairbanks, Fairbanks North Star Borough, Juneau, Kenai Peninsula Borough, Mat-Su Borough, and all other large municipalities support this provision to reduce dissolutions of small municipalities.)
3. **Removes the 'hold harmless'** which is about half of the funding of the current Municipal Assistance Program. The "hold harmless" provision creates wide variations among communities for no good reason. (For example, currently an 8% cut to Municipal Assistance may account for a 2.5% to 9.9% actual individual cut to a city.)
4. **Advances the payment date** for Municipal Assistance from February 1 to July 31, the same date on which Revenue Sharing payments are made. This provision **creates the internal equity** in the bill that allows support from all municipalities.

**Effects of CSSSSB20 (CRA) on FY 97 SRS/MA Payments**  
**(Based upon Governor's Budget; No base amount held harmless, \$40,000 overall minimum entitlement**  
**Explanation of Columns**

**Existing Program**

- (1) Payments municipalities will receive from revenue sharing under the FY 97 budget request
- (2) Payments municipalities will receive from municipal assistance under the FY 97 budget request
- (3) Total payments municipalities will receive from the two programs under the FY 97 budget request.

**CSSSSB 20 (CRA)**

**Hold Harmless**

- (4) Payments municipalities will receive from revenue sharing under the FY 97 budget request (no change from existing program shown on column 1)
- (5) Payment municipalities will receive from the Safe Communities Fund with the hold harmless provision of the base amount removed (may be compared with column 2)
- (6) Total payments municipalities would receive from the two programs if only the hold harmless provision were enacted (may be compared with column 3)
- (7) Percent difference in what would be received under CSSSSB 20 (CRA) and existing program if only the hold harmless provision were enacted

**Minimum Entitlement**

- (8) Additional funds needed for each community to receive a minimum of \$40,000. This amounts to \$238,909 or .45 percent of the total appropriation request of \$53.6 million
- (9) Additional funds that would actually be received after pro rating
- (10) Amount municipalities receive from the Safe Communities Fund after proration is made to make up the \$238,909 needed for minimum entitlements (may be compared with column 5)
- (11) Actual payment municipalities would receive from the Safe Communities Funds (may be compared to Columns 2 and 5)

**CSSSSB20(CRA) in its Entirety**

- (12) Total payments municipalities will receive from both revenue sharing and safe communities fund (may be compared to Columns 3 and 6)
- (13) Percent difference in what would be received under CSSSSB 20 (CRA) and existing program (may be compared with column 7).

**Potential Interest**

- (14) Amount of interest that could be earned because of the earlier payout of Safe Communities funds at 5 percent
- (15) Total amount received by municipalities from revenue sharing, safe communities and earned interest
- (16) Percent difference in what would be received under CSSSSB 20 (CRA) with interest and the existing program.

EFFECTS OF C8820 ON FY 87 SRS/MA PAYMENTS (BASED UPON GOV.'S BUDGET; NO BASE AMOUNT HOLD HARMLESS - \$40,000 OVERALL MINIMUM ENTITLEMENT)

Municipality	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	Potential Interest Earnings From Early SAFE Payment		
	Estimated FY 87 SRS \$	Estimated FY 87 MA %	Estimated FY 87 MA/SRS Total \$	C8820 FY 87 SRS \$	C8820 FY 87 SAFE \$ (No Hold Harmless)	FY 87 C8820 SRS/SAFE \$ Pre Min Ent	% Change From Current Programs	C8820 Minimum Ent. Add-On	C8820 Minimum Ent. Proposed	C8820 FY 87 SAFE \$ Proposed	C8820 FY 87 SAFE \$ Final Payment	FY 87 C8820 SRS/SAFE \$ Total Payment	% Change From Current Programs	FY 87 SAFE \$ at 5% Interest for 6 Months	FY 87 C8820 SRS/SAFE \$ Plus Interest	% Change From Current Programs
City of Abbeok	\$24,442	\$2,834	\$27,276	\$24,442	\$3,012	\$27,454	0.26%	\$12,648	\$12,445	\$2,888	\$15,433	\$38,678	45.88%	\$285	\$40,258	47.08%
City of Abiek	\$30,828	\$10,124	\$40,952	\$30,828	\$10,567	\$41,395	1.09%	\$0	\$0	\$10,482	\$10,482	\$41,108	0.88%	\$281	\$41,389	1.52%
City of Akutan	\$29,377	\$13,848	\$43,225	\$29,377	\$14,445	\$43,822	1.38%	\$0	\$0	\$14,328	\$14,328	\$43,705	1.12%	\$357	\$44,063	1.84%
City of Akutanuk	\$32,667	\$24,128	\$56,795	\$32,667	\$24,583	\$57,250	0.77%	\$0	\$0	\$24,385	\$24,385	\$57,032	0.42%	\$807	\$57,840	1.49%
City of Aleknagik	\$28,078	\$8,140	\$36,218	\$28,078	\$8,382	\$36,460	0.63%	\$4,559	\$4,522	\$8,311	\$10,833	\$38,812	13.33%	\$270	\$39,082	14.08%
Unincorporated East Borough	\$80,801	\$10,420	\$91,221	\$80,801	\$10,006	\$90,807	-0.48%	\$0	\$0	\$9,824	\$9,824	\$90,425	-0.55%	\$247	\$90,673	-0.27%
City of Alakabak	\$32,621	\$5,037	\$37,658	\$32,621	\$5,249	\$37,870	0.66%	\$2,230	\$2,212	\$5,208	\$7,418	\$39,840	6.34%	\$185	\$40,125	6.83%
City of Ambler	\$38,801	\$10,278	\$49,079	\$38,801	\$10,888	\$49,689	0.82%	\$0	\$0	\$10,581	\$10,581	\$49,482	0.64%	\$264	\$49,746	1.20%
City of Anaktuvuk Pass	\$31,302	\$8,218	\$39,520	\$31,302	\$8,824	\$40,126	1.00%	\$0	\$0	\$8,547	\$8,547	\$40,848	0.81%	\$238	\$41,087	1.40%
Unincorporated Anchorage	\$8,552,048	\$12,884,382	\$21,436,430	\$8,552,048	\$12,888,808	\$21,440,856	-0.14%	\$0	\$0	\$12,832,338	\$12,832,338	\$21,384,387	-0.68%	\$318,830	\$21,703,218	0.88%
City of Anderson	\$32,847	\$20,884	\$53,731	\$32,847	\$21,873	\$54,720	1.48%	\$0	\$0	\$21,489	\$21,489	\$54,448	1.12%	\$582	\$55,030	2.12%
City of Angoon	\$22,885	\$21,718	\$44,603	\$22,885	\$22,333	\$45,218	1.38%	\$0	\$0	\$22,153	\$22,153	\$45,138	0.97%	\$552	\$45,690	2.21%
City of Aniak	\$51,804	\$21,380	\$73,184	\$51,804	\$21,845	\$73,649	0.77%	\$0	\$0	\$21,788	\$21,788	\$73,372	0.53%	\$543	\$73,915	1.28%
City of Anvik	\$32,448	\$3,100	\$35,548	\$32,448	\$3,328	\$35,776	0.36%	\$4,324	\$4,289	\$3,302	\$7,491	\$38,839	12.35%	\$187	\$40,128	12.88%
City of Atkas	\$30,538	\$3,131	\$33,669	\$30,538	\$3,280	\$33,818	0.38%	\$8,201	\$8,181	\$3,202	\$9,385	\$39,824	18.57%	\$234	\$40,158	18.27%
City of Atkasuk	\$31,302	\$24,571	\$55,873	\$31,302	\$23,518	\$54,820	-1.88%	\$0	\$0	\$23,328	\$23,328	\$54,830	-2.22%	\$582	\$55,212	-1.18%
City of Barrow	\$100,075	\$158,185	\$258,260	\$100,075	\$160,289	\$260,364	1.89%	\$0	\$0	\$158,977	\$158,977	\$259,052	1.09%	\$3,984	\$263,036	2.64%
City of Bethel	\$278,448	\$228,151	\$506,599	\$278,448	\$230,241	\$508,689	0.41%	\$0	\$0	\$228,385	\$228,385	\$507,831	0.05%	\$5,894	\$513,525	1.17%
City of Bettles	\$33,607	\$1,577	\$35,184	\$33,607	\$1,884	\$35,491	0.02%	\$4,808	\$4,888	\$1,571	\$6,441	\$39,948	13.88%	\$181	\$40,128	14.32%
City of Brimley Mission	\$32,181	\$8,445	\$40,626	\$32,181	\$8,807	\$40,988	0.89%	\$0	\$0	\$8,738	\$8,738	\$40,897	0.72%	\$218	\$41,115	1.25%
Unincorporated Buckle	\$51,843	\$54,718	\$106,561	\$51,843	\$55,448	\$107,291	0.89%	\$0	\$0	\$55,001	\$55,001	\$106,844	0.27%	\$1,371	\$108,215	1.55%
City of Buckland	\$42,358	\$13,358	\$55,716	\$42,358	\$13,813	\$56,171	1.00%	\$0	\$0	\$13,801	\$13,801	\$56,159	0.80%	\$344	\$56,503	1.42%
City of Chulitna	\$30,495	\$12,138	\$42,633	\$30,495	\$12,818	\$43,313	1.13%	\$0	\$0	\$12,518	\$12,518	\$42,836	0.89%	\$312	\$43,323	1.62%
City of Chevak	\$28,818	\$21,528	\$50,346	\$28,818	\$22,478	\$51,296	1.84%	\$0	\$0	\$22,294	\$22,294	\$51,213	1.49%	\$558	\$51,771	2.57%
City of Chitina	\$28,552	\$4,730	\$33,282	\$28,552	\$4,904	\$33,456	0.51%	\$5,544	\$5,500	\$4,884	\$10,384	\$38,818	16.43%	\$258	\$40,174	17.18%
City of Chukchi	\$32,058	\$4,230	\$36,288	\$32,058	\$4,381	\$36,439	0.42%	\$3,583	\$3,534	\$4,348	\$7,880	\$39,938	10.88%	\$188	\$40,128	10.60%
City of Collins Cove	\$52,307	\$8,035	\$60,342	\$52,307	\$8,388	\$60,695	0.58%	\$0	\$0	\$8,320	\$8,320	\$60,827	0.47%	\$208	\$61,035	0.82%
City of Cold Bay	\$29,548	\$10,873	\$40,421	\$29,548	\$10,957	\$40,505	-0.04%	\$0	\$0	\$10,889	\$10,889	\$40,415	-0.28%	\$271	\$40,686	0.41%
City of Cordova	\$188,135	\$125,405	\$313,540	\$188,135	\$125,427	\$313,562	0.1%	\$0	\$0	\$124,418	\$124,418	\$312,551	-0.32%	\$3,102	\$315,653	0.87%
City of Crook	\$58,122	\$85,741	\$143,863	\$58,122	\$88,101	\$146,223	1.81%	\$0	\$0	\$87,552	\$87,552	\$145,674	2.82%	\$1,884	\$147,558	2.82%
City of Deering	\$48,846	\$5,242	\$54,088	\$48,846	\$5,422	\$54,268	0.33%	\$0	\$0	\$5,378	\$5,378	\$54,024	0.25%	\$134	\$54,158	0.50%
City of Delta Junction	\$28,853	\$55,128	\$83,981	\$28,853	\$53,881	\$82,734	-1.40%	\$0	\$0	\$53,528	\$53,528	\$82,078	-1.82%	\$1,334	\$83,413	-0.32%
Unincorporated Delta Junction	\$31,302	\$55,895	\$87,197	\$31,302	\$58,788	\$90,090	0.81%	\$0	\$0	\$58,328	\$58,328	\$89,830	0.36%	\$1,404	\$91,234	1.99%
City of Dillingham	\$102,220	\$87,188	\$189,408	\$102,220	\$88,188	\$190,408	0.51%	\$0	\$0	\$87,405	\$87,405	\$189,825	0.11%	\$2,428	\$192,253	1.33%
City of Diomede	\$31,302	\$4,888	\$36,190	\$31,302	\$5,108	\$36,410	0.68%	\$3,590	\$3,581	\$5,087	\$8,828	\$40,128	10.81%	\$218	\$40,346	10.80%
City of Eagle	\$28,488	\$5,381	\$33,869	\$28,488	\$5,531	\$34,019	0.44%	\$7,883	\$7,818	\$5,488	\$13,405	\$39,891	25.14%	\$334	\$40,225	28.18%
City of Eek	\$30,880	\$8,117	\$38,997	\$30,880	\$8,495	\$39,375	0.95%	\$0	\$0	\$8,418	\$8,418	\$39,298	0.76%	\$235	\$40,333	1.35%
City of Elsie	\$28,078	\$3,281	\$31,359	\$28,078	\$3,400	\$31,478	0.43%	\$7,521	\$7,480	\$3,373	\$10,853	\$39,812	23.41%	\$270	\$40,182	24.25%
City of Elm	\$32,873	\$9,131	\$42,004	\$32,873	\$9,501	\$42,374	0.88%	\$0	\$0	\$9,424	\$9,424	\$42,297	0.70%	\$235	\$42,532	1.26%
City of Emmonak	\$51,822	\$28,874	\$80,696	\$51,822	\$27,709	\$79,531	-1.00%	\$0	\$0	\$27,485	\$27,485	\$79,007	-0.75%	\$885	\$79,892	1.65%
City of Fairbanks	\$827,847	\$2,088,878	\$2,916,725	\$827,847	\$2,028,482	\$2,856,329	-1.48%	\$0	\$0	\$2,013,125	\$2,013,125	\$2,849,252	-2.08%	\$50,190	\$2,899,442	-0.14%
Unincorporated Fairbanks	\$1,742,873	\$2,128,827	\$3,871,700	\$1,742,873	\$2,155,338	\$3,898,211	0.66%	\$0	\$0	\$2,137,884	\$2,137,884	\$3,880,837	0.22%	\$53,303	\$3,934,140	1.68%
City of False Pass	\$28,078	\$2,810	\$30,888	\$28,078	\$3,018	\$31,096	0.34%	\$7,802	\$7,834	\$2,884	\$10,833	\$38,812	24.77%	\$270	\$40,182	25.81%
City of Fort Yukon	\$84,388	\$27,407	\$111,795	\$84,388	\$27,810	\$112,198	0.36%	\$0	\$0	\$27,888	\$27,888	\$112,074	0.18%	\$888	\$112,962	0.77%
City of Galena	\$48,890	\$23,384	\$72,274	\$48,890	\$23,888	\$72,778	0.68%	\$0	\$0	\$23,388	\$23,388	\$72,266	0.00%	\$883	\$73,149	0.85%
City of Galena II	\$32,828	\$21,032	\$53,860	\$32,828	\$21,809	\$54,637	1.48%	\$0	\$0	\$21,833	\$21,833	\$54,661	1.12%	\$838	\$55,499	2.13%
City of Galena III	\$32,801	\$5,513	\$38,314	\$32,801	\$5,883	\$38,684	0.44%	\$1,418	\$1,405	\$5,837	\$7,042	\$39,843	3.88%	\$178	\$40,021	4.44%
City of Goodnews Bay	\$30,172	\$7,892	\$38,064	\$30,172	\$8,343	\$38,515	0.93%	\$1,480	\$1,488	\$8,281	\$9,749	\$39,261	4.80%	\$243	\$40,184	5.24%
City of Grapeland	\$32,370	\$7,021	\$39,391	\$32,370	\$7,288	\$39,658	0.68%	\$0	\$0	\$7,230	\$7,230	\$39,339	1.38%	\$188	\$40,127	1.87%
City of Haines	\$48,480	\$83,872	\$132,352	\$48,480	\$83,848	\$132,328	0.33%	\$0	\$0	\$83,428	\$83,428	\$131,908	-0.13%	\$1,881	\$133,789	1.27%
Unincorporated Haines	\$26,824	\$38,831	\$65,655	\$26,824	\$37,883	\$64,707	1.20%	\$0	\$0	\$37,290	\$37,290	\$64,744	2.18%	\$830	\$65,574	2.13%
City of Holy Cross	\$31,888	\$8,804	\$40,692	\$31,888	\$10,243	\$42,131	0.82%	\$0	\$0	\$10,181	\$10,181	\$41,959	0.62%	\$253	\$42,212	1.23%
City of Homer	\$183,807	\$181,037	\$364,844	\$183,807	\$181,838	\$365,645	0.26%	\$0	\$0	\$180,391	\$180,391	\$365,998	-0.18%	\$4,747	\$370,745	1.18%
City of Igrook	\$88,803	\$38,188	\$126,991	\$88,803	\$35,808	\$124,611	0.80%	\$0	\$0	\$35,820	\$35,820	\$124,123	-0.38%	\$888	\$125,011	1.08%
City of Igrook Bay	\$28,851	\$35,548	\$64,399	\$28,851	\$34,785	\$63,636	1.02%	\$0	\$0	\$34,485	\$34,485	\$64,338	1.48%	\$880	\$65,188	2.83%
City of Houston	\$32,888	\$31,490	\$64,378	\$32,888	\$32,714	\$65,602	1.90%	\$0	\$0	\$32,451	\$32,451	\$64,950	1.48%	\$808	\$65,758	2.74%
City of Hughes	\$32,240	\$2,515	\$34,755	\$32,240	\$2,818	\$35,058	0.30%	\$5,141	\$5,088	\$2,888	\$7,997	\$39,837	14.81%	\$192	\$40,128	18.48%
City of Hulla	\$33,841	\$8,811	\$42,652	\$33,841	\$9,820	\$43,661	0.73%	\$0	\$0	\$9,848	\$9,848	\$43,589	0.56%	\$221	\$43,810	1.09%
City of Hydaburg	\$22,118	\$14,575	\$36,693	\$22,118	\$14,888	\$37,006	1.15%	\$2,882	\$2,858	\$14,878	\$17,737	\$39,858	8.82%	\$442	\$40,298	8.82%

EFFECTS OF C8820 ON FY 87 SRS/MA PAYMENTS (BASED UPON GOV.'S BUDGET; NO BASE AMOUNT HOLD HARMLESS - \$40,000 OVERALL MINIMUM ENTITLEMENT)

Municipality	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14) Potential Interest Earnings From Early SAFE Payment		
	Estimated FY 87 SRS \$	Estimated FY 87 MA \$	Estimated FY 87 SRS/MA Total \$	C8820 FY 87 SRS \$	C8820 FY 87 SAFE \$ (No Hold Harmless)	FY 87 C8820 SRS/SAFE \$ Pre Min Ent.	% Change From Current Programs	C8820 Minimum Ent. Add-On	C8820 Minimum Ent. Proposed	C8820 FY 87 SAFE \$ Proposed	C8820 FY 87 SAFE \$ Final Payment	FY 87 C8820 SRS/SAFE \$ Total Payment	% Change From Current Programs	FY 87 SAFE \$ at 5% Interest for 6 Months	FY 87 C8820 SRS/SAFE \$ Plus Interest	% Change From Current Programs
y & Borough of Juneau	\$1,584,112	\$1,301,027	\$2,885,139	\$1,584,112	\$1,319,455	\$2,877,887	0.43%	\$0	\$0	\$1,302,889	\$1,302,889	\$2,885,981	0.08%	\$32,482	\$2,889,453	1.20%
y of Kachemak	\$24,191	\$13,100	\$37,291	\$24,191	\$13,834	\$37,825	1.43%	\$2,175	\$2,187	\$13,825	\$15,882	\$39,973	6.92%	\$381	\$40,264	7.97%
y of Kake	\$49,181	\$24,180	\$73,361	\$49,181	\$24,971	\$74,132	1.08%	\$0	\$0	\$24,789	\$24,789	\$73,930	0.80%	\$818	\$74,648	1.85%
y of Kakevik	\$31,302	\$7,639	\$38,941	\$31,302	\$7,650	\$38,952	0.64%	\$848	\$841	\$7,787	\$8,828	\$39,930	2.64%	\$216	\$40,145	3.08%
y of Kasaan	\$32,829	\$8,021	\$40,850	\$32,829	\$8,389	\$41,214	0.81%	\$0	\$0	\$8,319	\$8,319	\$41,148	0.72%	\$207	\$41,354	1.24%
y of Kasaan	\$23,341	\$1,310	\$24,651	\$23,341	\$1,388	\$24,709	0.22%	\$16,284	\$15,170	\$1,354	\$18,825	\$39,888	61.72%	\$412	\$40,278	63.38%
y of Kasilof	\$208,888	\$384,826	\$574,525	\$208,888	\$382,888	\$572,788	-0.30%	\$0	\$0	\$388,884	\$358,884	\$588,883	0.76%	\$8,874	\$578,838	0.76%
nal Peninsula Borough	\$1,848,248	\$1,227,349	\$2,875,598	\$1,848,248	\$1,239,882	\$2,887,831	0.43%	\$0	\$0	\$1,228,881	\$1,228,881	\$2,877,840	0.06%	\$30,856	\$2,808,486	1.14%
y of Ketchikan	\$388,263	\$478,888	\$842,251	\$388,263	\$471,418	\$837,878	-0.84%	\$0	\$0	\$487,818	\$487,818	\$833,878	-0.89%	\$11,858	\$845,837	0.39%
Ichikun Gateway Borough	\$182,849	\$223,712	\$408,561	\$182,849	\$229,791	\$412,840	1.80%	\$0	\$0	\$227,839	\$227,839	\$410,788	1.04%	\$5,813	\$416,471	2.44%
y of Klaskan	\$28,855	\$14,370	\$44,025	\$28,855	\$14,883	\$44,088	1.10%	\$0	\$0	\$14,734	\$14,734	\$44,389	0.83%	\$387	\$44,786	1.68%
y of King Cove	\$44,838	\$28,278	\$73,814	\$44,838	\$30,377	\$74,813	1.49%	\$0	\$0	\$30,133	\$30,133	\$74,888	1.18%	\$751	\$75,420	2.18%
y of Kivalina	\$51,034	\$11,052	\$62,086	\$51,034	\$11,858	\$62,885	0.78%	\$0	\$0	\$11,442	\$11,442	\$62,478	0.83%	\$288	\$62,781	1.09%
y of Klawock	\$33,352	\$25,229	\$58,881	\$33,352	\$26,182	\$59,834	1.83%	\$0	\$0	\$25,871	\$25,871	\$59,323	1.27%	\$848	\$59,871	2.37%
y of Kobuk	\$33,077	\$2,823	\$35,810	\$33,077	\$2,843	\$35,720	0.31%	\$4,280	\$4,245	\$2,822	\$8,887	\$40,944	13.17%	\$171	\$40,118	12.83%
y of Kodiak	\$148,288	\$400,338	\$548,626	\$148,288	\$388,148	\$544,447	-0.40%	\$0	\$0	\$384,838	\$384,838	\$541,238	-0.89%	\$8,848	\$551,085	0.81%
Island Borough	\$447,388	\$231,112	\$678,508	\$447,388	\$239,007	\$688,403	1.18%	\$0	\$0	\$237,880	\$237,880	\$684,478	0.86%	\$5,811	\$688,387	1.76%
y of Kodiak	\$30,485	\$18,188	\$48,884	\$30,485	\$18,888	\$49,384	1.42%	\$0	\$0	\$18,737	\$18,737	\$49,232	1.11%	\$487	\$49,889	2.08%
y of Kotzebue	\$181,025	\$125,823	\$306,848	\$181,025	\$127,388	\$308,413	0.48%	\$0	\$0	\$128,381	\$128,381	\$307,388	0.14%	\$3,180	\$320,538	1.13%
y of Koyuk	\$32,883	\$8,883	\$41,046	\$32,883	\$9,421	\$41,421	0.81%	\$0	\$0	\$9,283	\$9,283	\$41,248	0.73%	\$231	\$41,477	1.23%
y of Koyuk	\$31,788	\$4,348	\$36,114	\$31,788	\$4,488	\$36,288	0.38%	\$3,744	\$3,714	\$4,452	\$8,188	\$38,834	10.88%	\$204	\$40,137	11.14%
y of Kuparuk	\$23,318	\$748	\$24,067	\$23,318	\$783	\$24,101	0.14%	\$18,888	\$18,771	\$777	\$18,848	\$38,888	65.84%	\$418	\$40,278	67.38%
y of Kuskokwim	\$28,844	\$22,888	\$52,833	\$28,844	\$23,782	\$53,888	1.83%	\$0	\$0	\$23,880	\$23,880	\$53,804	1.27%	\$887	\$54,092	2.38%
and Peninsula Borough	\$224,784	\$41,888	\$288,382	\$224,784	\$41,813	\$288,887	0.11%	\$0	\$0	\$41,878	\$41,878	\$288,380	-0.01%	\$1,037	\$287,388	0.38%
y of Larsen Bay	\$24,181	\$4,057	\$28,248	\$24,181	\$4,243	\$28,433	0.88%	\$11,887	\$11,474	\$4,388	\$15,882	\$38,872	41.18%	\$381	\$40,264	42.54%
y of Lower Kalamazoo	\$31,288	\$8,821	\$41,028	\$31,288	\$10,341	\$41,449	1.02%	\$0	\$0	\$10,188	\$10,188	\$41,387	0.82%	\$253	\$41,620	1.44%
y of Metchikof	\$28,484	\$12,888	\$42,380	\$28,484	\$13,411	\$42,885	1.28%	\$0	\$0	\$13,383	\$13,383	\$42,787	1.03%	\$332	\$43,128	1.81%
y of Metlakatla	\$30,485	\$8,824	\$40,319	\$30,485	\$10,285	\$40,780	0.84%	\$0	\$0	\$10,122	\$10,122	\$40,617	0.74%	\$252	\$40,870	1.37%
ly Borough	\$1,823,884	\$1,388,382	\$2,892,056	\$1,823,884	\$1,417,882	\$2,840,778	1.70%	\$0	\$0	\$1,408,881	\$1,408,881	\$2,828,355	1.31%	\$35,845	\$2,864,400	2.48%
y of McGrath	\$34,280	\$13,380	\$47,880	\$34,280	\$18,712	\$52,872	0.78%	\$0	\$0	\$18,881	\$18,881	\$52,821	0.80%	\$483	\$53,284	1.38%
y of Mekoryuk	\$30,828	\$8,852	\$37,880	\$30,828	\$7,134	\$37,882	0.78%	\$2,038	\$2,022	\$7,078	\$8,088	\$38,928	6.88%	\$227	\$40,153	6.58%
y of Mountain Village	\$31,252	\$25,871	\$57,223	\$31,252	\$28,881	\$58,113	1.88%	\$0	\$0	\$28,845	\$28,845	\$57,887	1.18%	\$884	\$58,881	2.34%
y of Nadiak	\$30,888	\$11,722	\$42,881	\$30,888	\$12,888	\$43,888	0.78%	\$0	\$0	\$11,883	\$11,883	\$43,832	0.88%	\$288	\$43,230	1.28%
y of Nainok	\$30,485	\$18,824	\$49,319	\$30,485	\$19,188	\$49,881	1.33%	\$0	\$0	\$19,080	\$19,080	\$49,885	1.03%	\$320	\$49,911	1.84%
y of Nanauli	\$48,223	\$27,828	\$76,051	\$48,223	\$27,821	\$76,744	-0.40%	\$0	\$0	\$27,888	\$27,888	\$76,822	-0.89%	\$881	\$77,203	0.20%
y of New Bayshore	\$28,878	\$13,818	\$42,888	\$28,878	\$14,085	\$43,184	1.33%	\$0	\$0	\$13,872	\$13,872	\$43,051	1.06%	\$348	\$43,388	1.88%
y of Newhalen	\$28,381	\$5,817	\$34,888	\$28,381	\$5,741	\$33,132	0.84%	\$4,888	\$4,828	\$5,885	\$10,823	\$38,814	14.34%	\$282	\$40,177	15.08%
y of Nighthawk	\$30,172	\$5,818	\$36,881	\$30,172	\$8,185	\$38,357	0.74%	\$3,843	\$3,813	\$8,135	\$9,748	\$38,821	10.81%	\$243	\$40,184	11.28%
y of Nohok	\$31,828	\$3,813	\$35,742	\$31,828	\$4,082	\$36,818	0.48%	\$4,082	\$4,048	\$4,059	\$8,188	\$38,924	11.73%	\$202	\$40,138	12.83%
y of Nome	\$288,073	\$177,407	\$478,480	\$288,073	\$178,814	\$477,887	0.30%	\$0	\$0	\$177,373	\$177,373	\$478,448	-0.01%	\$4,422	\$480,888	0.82%
y of Nondaton	\$38,434	\$7,824	\$43,258	\$38,434	\$8,128	\$43,880	0.70%	\$0	\$0	\$8,081	\$8,081	\$43,485	0.85%	\$201	\$43,888	1.01%
y of Norval	\$47,835	\$18,883	\$67,328	\$47,838	\$20,412	\$68,847	1.07%	\$0	\$0	\$20,248	\$20,248	\$68,883	0.82%	\$505	\$68,387	1.87%
y of North Pole	\$27,215	\$8,888	\$33,023	\$27,215	\$8,881	\$33,888	-0.18%	\$0	\$0	\$8,078	\$8,078	\$33,180	-0.78%	\$2,844	\$31,134	1.10%
th Borough	\$348,883	\$1,282,832	\$1,823,335	\$348,883	\$1,181,188	\$1,840,881	-8.87%	\$0	\$0	\$1,181,887	\$1,181,887	\$1,821,080	-0.28%	\$28,459	\$1,880,849	-4.48%
th Borough	\$234,187	\$24,378	\$258,835	\$234,187	\$24,874	\$258,731	0.88%	\$0	\$0	\$24,378	\$24,378	\$258,833	0.00%	\$888	\$259,141	0.23%
y of Nulato	\$31,982	\$12,828	\$44,128	\$31,982	\$13,488	\$44,707	1.31%	\$0	\$0	\$13,287	\$13,287	\$44,888	1.07%	\$332	\$44,931	1.82%
y of Nulato	\$32,818	\$11,884	\$44,788	\$32,818	\$12,311	\$44,228	1.02%	\$0	\$0	\$12,212	\$12,212	\$44,127	0.80%	\$304	\$44,432	1.48%
y of Nunapituk	\$42,848	\$14,548	\$57,494	\$42,848	\$18,187	\$58,118	1.08%	\$0	\$0	\$18,045	\$18,045	\$57,884	0.87%	\$378	\$58,388	1.82%
y of Old Harbor	\$24,888	\$10,821	\$35,728	\$24,888	\$10,440	\$35,528	1.18%	\$4,282	\$4,222	\$10,358	\$18,278	\$38,878	11.18%	\$381	\$40,287	11.23%
y of Ouzide	\$24,482	\$8,413	\$32,887	\$24,482	\$8,788	\$33,238	1.04%	\$8,782	\$8,788	\$8,888	\$18,383	\$38,878	21.21%	\$384	\$40,288	22.38%
y of Palmar	\$220,878	\$183,282	\$403,380	\$220,878	\$184,834	\$404,812	0.38%	\$0	\$0	\$183,345	\$183,345	\$403,423	0.02%	\$4,871	\$407,884	1.18%
y of Palmar	\$24,823	\$8,428	\$33,851	\$24,823	\$9,483	\$34,018	0.18%	\$5,884	\$5,838	\$8,418	\$18,352	\$40,875	17.45%	\$383	\$40,258	18.88%
y of Palmar	\$217,281	\$148,284	\$388,485	\$217,281	\$148,488	\$388,748	0.35%	\$0	\$0	\$148,280	\$148,280	\$388,841	0.02%	\$3,888	\$388,238	1.03%
y of Pilot Point	\$28,078	\$8,378	\$36,457	\$28,078	\$9,478	\$36,457	0.20%	\$7,445	\$7,385	\$7,448	\$18,832	\$36,812	22.87%	\$270	\$40,182	23.83%
y of Pilot Point	\$30,788	\$18,888	\$47,387	\$30,788	\$17,318	\$48,027	1.82%	\$0	\$0	\$17,178	\$17,178	\$47,887	1.23%	\$428	\$48,318	2.13%
y of Platina	\$31,483	\$1,888	\$33,282	\$31,483	\$1,811	\$33,314	0.07%	\$8,888	\$8,832	\$1,885	\$8,828	\$38,831	19.84%	\$213	\$40,143	20.88%
y of Point Hope	\$31,382	\$28,021	\$57,323	\$31,382	\$28,770	\$58,072	1.31%	\$0	\$0	\$28,654	\$28,654	\$58,858	0.83%	\$882	\$58,818	2.80%
y of Port Alexander	\$23,318	\$3,728	\$27,044	\$23,318	\$3,888	\$27,178	0.48%	\$12,824	\$12,720	\$3,827	\$18,848	\$38,888	47.41%	\$413	\$40,278	48.84%
y of Port Heiden	\$32,837	\$4,171	\$38,228	\$32,837	\$4,330	\$38,387	0.44%	\$3,813	\$3,883	\$4,288	\$7,878	\$38,938	10.24%	\$181	\$40,132	10.78%

EFFECTS OF CSB20 ON FY 97 BRS/MA PAYMENTS (BASED UPON GOV.'S BUDGET; NO BASE AMOUNT HOLD HARMLESS - \$40,000 OVERALL MINIMUM ENTITLEMENT)

Municipality	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	Potential Interest Earnings From Early SAFE Payment		
	Estimated FY 97 BRS \$	Estimated FY 97 MA \$	Estimated FY 97 MA/BRS Total \$	CSB20 FY 97 BRS \$	CSB20 FY 97 SAFE \$ [No Hold Harmless]	FY 97 CSB20 BRS/SAFE \$ Pre Min Ent.	% Change From Current Programs	CSB20 Minimum Ent. Add-On	CSB20 Minimum Ent. Prorated	CSB20 FY 97 SAFE \$ Prorated	CSB20 FY 97 SAFE \$ Final Payment	FY 97 CSB20 BRS/SAFE \$ Total Payment	% Change From Current Programs	FY 97 SAFE \$ at 5% Interest for 8 Months	FY 97 CSB20 BRS/SAFE \$ Plus Interest	% Change From Current Programs
City of Port Lions	\$24,538	\$8,541	\$33,080	\$24,538	\$8,541	\$33,079	1.05%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$33,079	20.64%	\$382	\$40,258	21.70%	
City of Oulihagak	\$30,824	\$17,828	\$48,652	\$30,824	\$18,551	\$49,375	1.48%	\$0	\$0	\$18,401	\$48,225	1.18%	\$459	\$49,684	2.12%	
City of Rudy	\$32,328	\$7,321	\$39,649	\$32,328	\$7,558	\$39,886	0.80%	\$114	\$113	\$7,497	\$39,938	0.73%	\$190	\$40,128	1.21%	
City of Russian Mission	\$30,861	\$9,252	\$39,913	\$30,861	\$9,867	\$40,728	1.04%	\$0	\$0	\$9,589	\$39,589	0.85%	\$239	\$40,490	1.44%	
City of Sand Point	\$50,087	\$35,312	\$85,378	\$50,087	\$36,380	\$86,427	1.23%	\$0	\$0	\$36,087	\$86,134	0.88%	\$889	\$87,033	1.84%	
City of Savoonga	\$32,043	\$21,192	\$53,235	\$32,043	\$21,862	\$53,905	1.26%	\$0	\$0	\$21,886	\$53,729	0.93%	\$541	\$54,269	1.94%	
City of Saaman	\$22,778	\$13,674	\$36,452	\$22,778	\$14,184	\$36,930	1.32%	\$3,070	\$3,045	\$14,040	\$37,085	8.38%	\$428	\$40,287	10.53%	
City of Scammon Bay	\$30,232	\$14,097	\$44,329	\$30,232	\$14,689	\$44,901	1.28%	\$0	\$0	\$14,551	\$44,783	1.02%	\$383	\$45,148	1.84%	
City of Salekik	\$71,207	\$21,278	\$92,485	\$71,207	\$22,111	\$93,318	0.90%	\$0	\$0	\$21,933	\$93,140	0.71%	\$547	\$93,687	1.30%	
City of Salskiva	\$25,478	\$18,881	\$44,359	\$25,478	\$18,819	\$44,297	0.09%	\$0	\$0	\$18,780	\$44,268	-0.22%	\$384	\$44,652	0.73%	
City of Seward	\$281,544	\$140,327	\$421,871	\$281,544	\$140,981	\$422,525	0.16%	\$0	\$0	\$139,844	\$422,388	-0.12%	\$3,487	\$404,876	0.75%	
City of Shageluk	\$31,302	\$4,883	\$36,185	\$31,302	\$4,854	\$36,156	0.83%	\$3,844	\$3,813	\$4,815	\$36,970	11.02%	\$215	\$40,145	11.82%	
City of Shalotik	\$31,978	\$8,318	\$39,297	\$31,978	\$8,583	\$39,571	0.71%	\$1,428	\$1,418	\$8,540	\$39,857	4.28%	\$188	\$40,134	4.80%	
City of Sheldon Point	\$30,172	\$5,201	\$35,373	\$30,172	\$5,423	\$35,595	0.63%	\$4,405	\$4,369	\$5,380	\$39,749	12.88%	\$243	\$40,164	13.54%	
City of Shikhsari	\$32,151	\$17,899	\$49,950	\$32,151	\$18,382	\$50,533	1.37%	\$0	\$0	\$18,233	\$49,384	1.07%	\$458	\$50,839	1.88%	
City of Shungnak	\$34,571	\$8,789	\$43,360	\$34,571	\$9,033	\$43,604	0.56%	\$0	\$0	\$8,981	\$43,585	0.91%	\$223	\$43,755	0.91%	
City and Borough of Sitka	\$388,130	\$418,590	\$806,720	\$388,130	\$421,103	\$809,233	0.31%	\$0	\$0	\$417,709	\$805,839	-0.11%	\$10,414	\$826,253	1.17%	
City of Skagway	\$28,935	\$48,892	\$77,827	\$28,935	\$48,318	\$77,253	-0.76%	\$0	\$0	\$48,942	\$77,877	1.26%	\$1,145	\$78,723	0.26%	
City of Solovik	\$127,813	\$227,654	\$355,467	\$127,813	\$224,973	\$352,786	-0.73%	\$0	\$0	\$223,180	\$352,873	-1.24%	\$5,584	\$358,457	0.33%	
City of St. George	\$77,314	\$8,223	\$85,537	\$77,314	\$8,489	\$85,803	0.32%	\$0	\$0	\$8,438	\$85,742	0.28%	\$180	\$85,922	0.45%	
City of St. Mary's	\$83,867	\$18,567	\$102,434	\$83,867	\$18,198	\$102,065	0.83%	\$0	\$0	\$18,067	\$102,132	0.50%	\$401	\$102,533	0.91%	
City of St. Michael	\$32,142	\$14,750	\$46,892	\$32,142	\$14,905	\$47,047	0.33%	\$0	\$0	\$14,785	\$46,927	0.07%	\$389	\$47,295	0.86%	
City of St. Paul	\$99,115	\$24,442	\$123,557	\$99,115	\$25,490	\$124,605	0.85%	\$0	\$0	\$25,285	\$124,400	0.68%	\$830	\$125,030	1.19%	
City of Stikine	\$32,744	\$18,142	\$50,886	\$32,744	\$18,791	\$51,535	1.36%	\$0	\$0	\$18,684	\$50,428	1.09%	\$291	\$48,798	1.90%	
City of Tanana	\$38,329	\$13,204	\$51,533	\$38,329	\$13,622	\$51,951	0.81%	\$0	\$0	\$13,413	\$51,742	0.40%	\$334	\$52,077	1.03%	
City of Tetli	\$31,584	\$8,724	\$40,308	\$31,584	\$9,089	\$40,673	0.93%	\$0	\$0	\$9,025	\$40,698	0.75%	\$225	\$40,923	1.31%	
City of Tenakee Springs	\$23,318	\$4,958	\$28,276	\$23,318	\$4,905	\$28,223	0.17%	\$11,777	\$11,683	\$4,885	\$18,548	\$39,886	41.49%	\$413	\$40,278	42.05%
City of Thome Bay	\$28,585	\$21,414	\$49,999	\$28,585	\$22,248	\$49,833	1.73%	\$0	\$0	\$22,086	\$48,651	1.38%	\$550	\$49,201	2.51%	
City of Toolik	\$30,384	\$28,350	\$58,734	\$30,384	\$27,158	\$57,542	1.43%	\$0	\$0	\$28,840	\$57,324	1.04%	\$872	\$57,898	2.22%	
City of Toksook Bay	\$30,495	\$17,132	\$47,627	\$30,495	\$17,788	\$48,283	1.40%	\$0	\$0	\$17,655	\$47,850	1.10%	\$440	\$48,290	2.02%	
City of Unalakleet	\$32,644	\$27,944	\$60,588	\$32,644	\$28,700	\$61,344	1.25%	\$0	\$0	\$28,489	\$60,113	0.87%	\$710	\$60,823	2.04%	
City of Unalakleet	\$234,654	\$134,929	\$369,583	\$234,654	\$140,122	\$374,776	1.41%	\$0	\$0	\$138,893	\$373,647	1.10%	\$3,465	\$377,112	2.04%	
City of Upper Kalsag	\$31,193	\$7,021	\$38,214	\$31,193	\$7,180	\$38,373	0.42%	\$1,627	\$1,614	\$7,122	\$38,259	4.48%	\$218	\$40,147	8.08%	
City of Valdez	\$211,001	\$507,897	\$718,898	\$211,001	\$484,581	\$695,582	-3.23%	\$0	\$0	\$480,875	\$676,876	-3.78%	\$11,884	\$708,680	-2.09%	
City of Valdez	\$31,302	\$17,344	\$48,646	\$31,302	\$18,083	\$49,385	1.52%	\$0	\$0	\$17,937	\$48,239	1.22%	\$447	\$49,686	2.14%	
City of Wales	\$31,837	\$5,400	\$37,237	\$31,837	\$5,848	\$37,685	0.88%	\$2,717	\$2,695	\$5,801	\$38,286	7.82%	\$207	\$40,139	8.38%	
City of Wasilla	\$118,258	\$109,188	\$317,454	\$118,258	\$201,408	\$319,667	0.70%	\$0	\$0	\$189,788	\$318,044	0.18%	\$4,981	\$323,025	1.78%	
City of White Mountain	\$31,111	\$6,553	\$37,664	\$31,111	\$6,848	\$37,959	0.78%	\$2,041	\$2,025	\$6,792	\$38,617	8.01%	\$220	\$40,148	8.60%	
City of Whittier	\$28,744	\$10,498	\$39,242	\$28,744	\$10,770	\$39,514	0.73%	\$2,488	\$2,448	\$10,684	\$39,893	7.08%	\$327	\$40,221	7.84%	
City of Wrangell	\$197,959	\$124,918	\$322,877	\$197,959	\$125,721	\$323,680	0.25%	\$0	\$0	\$124,707	\$322,666	-0.08%	\$3,109	\$325,176	0.90%	
City and Borough of Yakutat	\$27,888	\$38,888	\$66,776	\$27,888	\$38,003	\$65,891	0.03%	\$0	\$0	\$38,889	\$66,778	-0.44%	\$885	\$67,663	1.00%	
				\$185,908 moves from certain communities to other communities as a result of change in MA Base Amount (i.e., base not held harmless) (this represents .36 of 1% of all BRS/MA appropriation)				\$238,908 = Minimum Entitlement Make-Up \$								
				All communities share in making up this \$238,908 (this represents .45 of 1% of all BRS/MA appropriation)												

note: Three communities were not included in the above table for a variety of reasons. Their estimated allocations are listed below.

	EST. 97 BRS	EST. 97 MA	T-M 97 BRS/MA	97 SAFE	Total BRS/SAFE	Difference	
Metakatsi	\$7,148	\$8,466	\$15,614	\$7,848	\$15,397	(\$217)	Metakatsi participates in BRS as an unincorporated community, and MA effectively as a municipality
Clark's Point	\$0	\$1,988	\$1,988	\$2,084	\$2,084	\$86	Clark's Point has been largely inactive as a municipality. Has not filed program applications.
Newly Incorporated Municipality	\$28,078	\$8,380	\$36,458	\$10,631	\$39,810	\$3,352	Newly Incorporated Municipality.

HOUSE COMMITTEE REPORT

11-11-96  
Finance

(7)  
Date Referred to Committee: April 2, 1996

FURTHER REFERRALS:

Date of Committee Action: 4-11-96

The COMMUNITY AND REGIONAL AFFAIRS Committee considered:

CSSSSB 20(FIN)

CS FOR SPONSOR SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE BILL NO. 20(FIN)

ALASKA MUNICIPAL BASIC SERVICES PROGRAM

"An Act relating to certain programs of state aid to municipalities and recipients in the unorganized borough; and providing for an effective date."

recommends it be replaced with the following committee substitute \_\_\_\_\_  the same title  a new title

additional referral to \_\_\_\_\_ Committee  
 attached amendment(s)

ADOPTS: \_\_\_\_\_ Letter of Intent

ATTACHES NEW FISCAL NOTE(S): (Dept)

APPROVES PREVIOUS: (Dept/Date)

fiscal note(s) \_\_\_\_\_

<sup>Senate</sup> fiscal note(s) Dept of Revenue / 3-18-96

zero fiscal note(s) \_\_\_\_\_

<sup>Senate</sup> zero fiscal note(s) ICRA / 3-18-96

SIGNING WITH RECOMMENDATIONS		DP	DNP	NR	AM
	MACKIE	✓			
	ELTAN	✓			
	AUDERMITT	✓			
	VEZEV			✓	
	KOTT			✓	
	NICHOLAS	✓			
	IVAN	✓			
		(5)		(2)	

CHAIR'S SIGNATURE   
IVAN

AUDERMITT

## City of Soldotna

177 North Birch • Soldotna, Alaska 99669 • Phone: (907) 262-9107



April 11, 1996

Representative Ivan M. Ivan, Co-Chairman  
House Community & Regional Affairs Committee  
Room 124, State Capitol  
Juneau, Alaska 99801-1182

Fax No. 485-4589

Dear Representative Ivan:

The City of Soldotna supports the passage of Senate Bill 20 as it was passed by the Senate. We were unable to send someone to the scheduled teleconference at 1:00 PM today and ask that this letter be entered as testimony. Accompanying this is a letter from Mayor Ken Lancaster to Senator John Torgerson which also reflects the City's support for this legislation.

We thank you for the opportunity to express our views.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "T. Boedeker", is written over a light blue horizontal line.

Thomas R. Boedeker  
City Manager

cc: Representative Gary Davis  
Representative Gail Phillips, Speaker



## CITY OF HOONAH

P.O. Box 380 • Hoonah, Alaska 99829 • (907) 945-3883 • FAX (907) 945-3445

March 1, 1996

Honorable Tony Knowles  
Governor of the State of Alaska  
Po Box 110001  
Juneau, Alaska 99811-0001

Re: Support for SB 20 - "Safe Communities" Bill.

Dear Governor Knowles:

The City of Hoonah cannot afford any more cuts in our Municipal Assistance and State Revenue Sharing as proposed by the administration. The City of Hoonah is in full support of SB 20 as I have testified at the last hearing. By passage of this bill it enables the community to effectively project their fiscal year budgets. I am at a loss as why the Administration would be in opposition to this bill. This bill enables the small communities to receive much needed support from the larger communities with the larger communities taking the larger cuts.

The Alaska Conference of Mayors have worked for the past two years to develop a bill that is not only good for the communities but also for the State of Alaska. Small communities use these funds to provide essential services to their communities and without these funds they will be required to start cutting services or even completely dissolving their governments.

Over the past ten years we have had more than 50% cuts in our Municipal Assistance and State Revenue Sharing that has a serious impact on our budget. As the Mayor of Hoonah it has been hard taking these cuts. By changing Municipal Assistance to "Safe Communities" it enables the state to prioritize state revenues to be spent on critical municipal services.

I am requesting for you as Governor to please consider supporting and signing Senate Bill 20 in its present form.

Sincerely,

Albert W. Dick  
Mayor of Hoonah

cc: Senator Zharoff  
Representative Mackie  
Alaska Municipal League



RECEIVED

AUG 24 1995

ALASKA MUNICIPAL LEAGUE

**CITY OF HOONAH**

P.O. Box 360 • Hoonah, Alaska 99829 • (907) 945-3663 • FAX (907) 945-3445

August 21, 1995

Long Range Fiscal Planning Commission  
Brian Rogers, Chairperson  
716 West 4th  
Anchorage, Alaska 99501

Dear Mr. Rogers:

For the past three years small communities such as Hoonah have fought hard to keep the Legislature from cutting Municipal Assistance and State Revenue Sharing completely. In the past six years they have cut the funding for both Municipal Assistance and State Revenue Sharing more than 50%. As a small community with only a 4% sales tax for revenue we would be unable to continue providing services to the people of Hoonah if they eliminate these two programs.

The City of Hoonah feels that it would be a major mistake to completely eliminate the Municipal Assistance, State Revenue Sharing, Capital Matching Grants, and other Municipal Grants and Programs. Every year when our Finance Committee works on our budget it gets more complicated to find the money needed just to provide basic services.


As the Mayor of Hoonah I have been working on finding the needed resources from both the State of Alaska and from the Federal Government to build a much needed water treatment plant. In the past three years we have had little to no success and with each passing day it continues to get harder to provide treated water to our community.

As I stated in my first paragraph without these programs, small communities will be forced too dissolved. If that happens the cost to the State to provide these services will be much higher. Small government issues are not an easy task. Any cuts to the School Foundation Funding Programs affect the local government. The local fishermen are having a very slow if not bad year and the effects will show in our Raw Fish Tax. The Subsistence issues, the IFQ issue, all these affect the City along with the cut backs in the fishing season. The total loss of forest service receipts will also drastically effect the City and the School. Generators generate our power and without the power equalization fund most of our citizens cannot afford power to their homes. Our community is also going to have to face what the Welfare Reform Act will do to some of our citizens.

So what I am asking you, when the committee is sitting around making suggestions to the Governor concerning long range fiscal planning. Please do not forget what the effects are going to be not only to the State, but also the small local governments.

I would like to thank the committee for taking the time in reading this letter, and to ask that they keep us informed concerning any recommendations your commission may develop.

Sincerely,



Albert W. Dick, Mayor

cc: Governor Tony Knowles  
Senator Fred Zharoff  
Representative Jerry Mackie  
Kevin Ritchie, AML Executive Director  
Senator Jim Duncan

Pictured is the original  
Eagle City Hall,  
still currently in use.



Eagle is the oldest  
incorporated city in  
interior Alaska.  
(January 8, 1901)

CITY OF EAGLE - BOX 18 - EAGLE, ALASKA 99738

October 24, 1995

Tony Knowles  
Governor  
State of Alaska  
Juneau, AK 99801

RECEIVED  
OCT 27 1995  
ALASKA MUNICIPAL LEAGUE

Dear Governor Knowles,

We fully understand the need to make cuts in the state budget, but we are writing to request that you do not do it on the backs of the incorporated cities, though we do need to assist you in balancing the budget. Our community is small, but we do have taxes and we work to provide basic services to all the residents. The cuts that have been made in the state revenue sharing over the past years are disproportionately felt in our rural towns.

We support the proposal to maintain the revenue sharing appropriation to 3% of the state operating budget. Our city needs this stability in order to carry on our basic programs. With this compromise, we could all share and work together in balancing the state budget.

We also support setting a \$40,000 minimum funding level for incorporated communities. This would encourage the smaller areas to incorporate and maintain that status which I understand is one of the state's goals. More attention also needs to be given to assure that all communities get a fair share now and in the future.

We would be very appreciative if you would support the above recommendations.

Sincerely,

*Elva Scott*

Elva Scott, Mayor  
Eagle City Council

cc: Alaska Municipal League

**Municipality  
of  
Anchorage**



P.O. Box 190680  
Anchorage, Alaska 99519-0680  
Telephone: (907) 848-4481  
Fax: (907) 848-4499

*Rick Mystrom, Mayor*

February 14, 1996

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR

**FAX: 465-2779**

Senator John Torgerson  
State Capitol  
Room 427  
Juneau, AK 99801-1182

Dear Senator Torgerson:

I have reviewed, and strongly support, the latest work draft of Senate Bill 20. Your efforts have produced a bill which will benefit all Alaskan communities.

For too long, Alaska's municipalities have had to bear the brunt of state budget cuts. From 1986 to 1996, the Municipality of Anchorage has seen a 62% drop in state assistance. During this same ten-year period, the state operating budget has actually increased by about 4%. Other Alaska communities have faced similar reductions. As these state revenues decreased, the taxes paid by local residents have increased.

SB 20 emphasizes a Safe Communities approach, and will prioritize state revenues be spent on critical municipal Safe Communities services. It will redefine the state shared revenues formula so citizens will better understand its goals and the role state dollars play in creating and maintaining Safe Communities. I believe this approach will make these critical local basic services more visible.

Thank you for your continued assistance in initiating and supporting this important legislation. Your efforts help make our communities safer and better places in which to live, work, and raise our families.

Sincerely,



Rick Mystrom  
Mayor

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

Submitted by: Assemblymembers Murdy, Wuerch and  
Abney

CLERK'S OFFICE

Prepared by: Assembly Policy & Budget Office

APPROVED

For reading: February 27, 1996

Date: 2-27-96

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

AR 96- 41

**A RESOLUTION OF THE ANCHORAGE MUNICIPAL ASSEMBLY REQUESTING THAT THE GOVERNOR AND STATE LEGISLATURE CEASE MAKING DISPROPORTIONATE CUTS TO EXISTING MUNICIPAL REVENUES AND PROGRAMS THAT FORCE HIGHER LOCAL TAXES OR CUTS TO BASIC LOCAL PUBLIC SERVICES**

WHEREAS, oil revenues are collected by the State government, but do not belong to the State Government. Oil revenues belong to all of the people of the State to ensure a basic level of public services in all communities, whether provided by State or Municipal government; and

WHEREAS, State revenue sharing with municipalities is not unique to Alaska and is not an oil boom program. According to a federal research agency, every state in the United States provides some form of revenue sharing. Alaska is now below the average among the western states for sharing state revenue with its municipalities; and

WHEREAS, the percentage of the State budget appropriated for municipal revenue sharing has now been cut to the same level as in 1972, well before the oil boom, when many municipalities lacked the finances to construct and support basic services such as water, sewer, adequate public safety services, and health services; and

WHEREAS, since 1986 the State has shifted an estimated \$200 million of costs to local taxpayers through cuts to municipal revenue sharing, transfers of State service responsibilities, and unfunded State mandates on municipalities. Since 1986, all sales and property tax increases among municipal governments total only \$188 million per year. Therefore, all or most sales and property tax increases paid by Alaska citizens since 1986 went to balance the State's budget; and

WHEREAS, since 1986, the State has cut the Municipal Assistance/Revenue Sharing by \$63 million, which is approximately twice the amount of any "new tax" proposed by the Long Range Financial Planning Commission for implementation during this century; and

WHEREAS, the impact of the State's cuts in revenue sharing, cuts in other municipal programs, and new unfunded mandates on municipalities since 1986 is roughly equal to taking away the value of one Permanent Fund Dividend check from every family that pays property tax; and

WHEREAS, approximately half (or \$10 million) of the actual reductions in the State's proposed budget for next year simply "passes the buck" to local taxpayers; and

WHEREAS, the proposed State budget for next year would cut the State operations less than 1% while the proposed cut to direct municipal revenue sharing is 8%; and

1 WHEREAS, cuts in municipal revenue sharing and the resulting fiscal pressures have  
 2 been a major factor in municipal dissolutions. Many smaller communities are considering  
 3 unincorporating and giving the responsibility for providing local services back to the State  
 4 government. The cost to the State to provide services will be much higher than the cost of  
 5 municipal revenue sharing; and  
 6

7 WHEREAS, in the explanation of the proposed State budget, it states that the "Overall  
 8 reduction in State aid to local governments/school districts is 1.2%". Schools are not a  
 9 municipal aid program. The Alaska Constitution states, "The legislature shall by general law  
 10 establish and maintain a system of public schools...". It is clearly a State responsibility to  
 11 provide for education. The actual proposed overall reduction in State aid to local governments  
 12 is actually 8-10%; and  
 13

14 WHEREAS, all municipal governments balance their budgets and that many municipal  
 15 governments use long range fiscal planning tools; and  
 16

17 WHEREAS, the Alaska Municipal League and the Alaska Conference of Mayors have  
 18 adopted resolutions supporting the development of a Long Range Financial Plan for Alaska,  
 19 and have offered to work in partnership with the State to develop the plan (see attached AML  
 20 Resolution 96-3).  
 21

22 NOW, THEREFORE, The Anchorage Municipal Assembly resolves:  
 23

24 That the Governor and State Legislature are requested to:  
 25

- 26 1. Carefully study the impact of State budget actions and avoid passing a  
 27 disproportionate share of cuts, transfers, and unfunded mandates on local  
 28 taxpayers.  
 29
- 30 2. Support the implementation of the "Revenue Sharing for Safe Communities"  
 31 program developed by the Alaska Municipal League (AML) and the Alaska  
 32 Conference of Mayors (ACoM) to improve and stabilize the current Municipal  
 33 Assistance and Revenue Sharing Programs (see attached background  
 34 information).  
 35
- 36 3. Work in formal partnership with municipalities as proposed by the AML and  
 37 ACoM to develop a State/Municipal Long Range Financial and Services Plan for  
 38 Alaska in recognition of the fact that the State and Municipal governments jointly  
 39 provide Alaska's public services and that both serve the same citizens/taxpayers.  
 40

41 PASSED AND APPROVED by the Anchorage Assembly this \_\_\_\_\_ day of  
 42 \_\_\_\_\_, 1996.  
 43

44 \_\_\_\_\_  
 45 Chair

46 ATTEST:  
 47

48 \_\_\_\_\_  
 49  
 50 Municipal Clerk  
 51



**CITY OF UNALAKLEET**

BOX 28  
UNALAKLEET, ALASKA  
99804  
(907) 824-3631  
FAX (907) 824-3130

February 27, 1996

Senator John Torgerson  
State Capitol, Rm. 427  
Juneau, Alaska 99801-1182

Post-it brand fax transmittal memo 7871		# of pages = 2
To	AML EYT	City of Unalakleet
From		
Dept.		Phone #
Fax #		Fax #

Dear Senator Torgerson:

The City of Unalakleet strongly urges the passage of Senate Bill 20-- "Safe Communities". It has become increasingly difficult over recent years for our community to make cuts in keeping with the cuts sustained to Municipal Assistance and Revenue Sharing. We are not alone in this situation because as I talk to members of other communities I find that they are also hurting and in many cases are on the brink of dissolving local government entirely.

We are constantly working to improve our tax base. Here in Unalakleet we are working in conjunction with the local Native Corporation, the local IRA and other groups to replace our old fish plant with emphasis not only on market-ready fresh fish but with value-added products as well. We are supporting the tourism efforts of the Unalakleet Native Corporation with their Unalakleet River Lodge. We are working to expand our community across a narrow slough which is the only place to expand, as we sit on a spit of land currently with water on three sides and the airport on the other. In short, we are working very diligently and in harmony with all the various community groups to make our community a thriving place to live. We need the "Safe Communities" support to sustain us in our efforts.

Public Safety is something that, in our second class city, is not sustained by any particular revenue source other than the current Municipal Assistance and Revenue Sharing and the minimal amount of protective custody fees. So the City runs a Bingo/Pulltab game of which 100% of all revenues derived go directly to support the police department. However, that amounts to \$25,000-\$30,000/yr. With a Chief, two officers and support dispatchers/jailers, our current Public Safety budget is \$179,318. The City collects a 5% Sales Tax, 2% of which is dedicated to support our new solid waste baler facility. The Sales Tax revenue that was not dedicated to the baler operation in FY95 was \$139,138. The City does not receive revenues from fish taxes as do many coastal communities in Southeast Alaska or Bristol Bay. So as you can see, with the cuts in MARS, our general fund revenues continue to shrink while demand for services continues. Staffing turnover is high because of the workload, job stress and low pay. It is difficult to build a credible workforce when salaries remain static.

Page 2  
February 27, 1996

The above scenario is not unique to Linalakem only. It is happening statewide, but the most immediate impacts are on small communities with limited revenue-generating capacity. We simply must have the assistance in order to survive.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on SD20. I urge you not to delay in its passage.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Henry Ivanoff, Sr.", written over a horizontal dashed line.

Henry Ivanoff, Sr.  
Mayor

cc: City Council  
file

TO: Senator John Torgerson  
Fax 907 469-4779  
RM: SB 20

FROM: Joe Lawton  
Fax 907 746-2699  
Phone 907 746-7152 D10


Dear Senator Torgerson:

Count me as one Alaskan who heavily supports the passage of SB20, the Safe Communities Bill.

Long have we struggled to find equity and value in the distribution of State revenues to local governments. At last you have forged a compromise which is supported by nearly every community in the State. The Legislature would be remiss not to pass this bill. Alaskans everywhere want to see fewer decisions made in Juneau and more made locally.

Thank you for your efforts to bring this bill to the floor. It is a landmark bill, and I desperately hope your colleagues see it as that. It and a long-range fiscal plan solution in this legislature would insure your place in history.

Sincerely yours,



549 E. Caribou  
Palmar AK 99645



# City of Old Harbor

P.O. Box 100  
Old Harbor, Alaska 99643

CITY OF THE THREE SAINTS

(907) 236-2203 OR 236-2204

FAX: 236-2278



FEBRUARY 21, 1996

SENATOR JOHN TORGERSON  
STATE CAPITOL  
JUNEAU, AK 99801-1182

RE: THE "SAFE COMMUNITY" BILL

DEAR SENATOR TORGERSON,


The City of Old Harbor is writing in support of SB 20, the "Safe Community" Bill. The City supports this bill for several important reasons:

- THE AMOUNT OF STATE SHARED REVENUES THE CITY RECEIVES HAS DECLINED DRASTICALLY OVER THE PAST 10 YEARS. THIS BILL WILL RAISE THE AMOUNT RECEIVED BY OLD HARBOR AND SET A FUNDING LEVEL WE CAN COUNT ON FOR YEARS TO COME; and
- THIS BILL WILL GIVE THE CITY THE STATE SHARED REVENUES SOON AFTER THE FISCAL YEAR WHEN THE CITY OPERATIONS IS IN MOST NEED OF FUNDS.

The City urges you and your fellow Legislators to pass this Bill. Thank you for your efforts to help Rural municipalities.

SINCERELY,

JAMES NESTIC, Vice Mayor  
Old Harbor, Ak



P.O. Box 46  
Kenosha, Wis. 53102

City Hall  
943-3461  
Police Dept.  
442-3351  
Fire Dept.  
943-3404  
Public Works  
943-3461

February 20, 1996

Senator John Torgerson  
Room 427  
State Capitol  
Anchorage, Alaska  
99501-1182

Dear Senator:

We are happy to support the revised version of SB20: The "Safe Communities" Bill. The City of Kenosha will support this bill because of the following:

- This bill changes the program title from Municipal Assistance to "Safe Communities" so that the public have the important services as required by the funds. "Municipal Assistance" is often confused with welfare or a giveaway. Expenses during a really your communities' share of Alaska's resources.
- "Safe-Communities" does not reduce current funding for road maintenance, hospitals, etc., but requires that revenue sharing (that is an otherwise allowed in states) be used for high priority local public safety services. The public safety support drives public safety expenditures and requires accountability.
- The bill provides a minimum funding level of \$40,000 without significantly impacting funding for larger cities. This provision has been agreed upon by all of Alaska's large communities to help them around the incentives for small municipalities to operate.
- The bill requires distribution of all of the funds near the beginning of the state fiscal year instead of the following February. The cities should not withhold money for municipalities, especially after the funding has been cut over 50% over the past ten years.
- Funding will not be significantly reduced for any community.
- This bill makes additional more equitable among municipalities.

Thank you for your efforts in this matter.

Sincerely,

  
Michael J. Seck  
City Manager

Copy:

File

North and Northwest Mayor's

Sen. Al Adams

Rep. Don Long

NSB Mayor: George Ahmaogak

Lon Sorsella

Enoch Oldalik

Herman Kignak

Michael Neakok, Sr.

Paul Hugo

NW Mayors: Miles Cleveland, Sr.

Willie Thomas

Gilbert S. Barr

Oscar Sage, Sr.

Frank Greene

Lee Ballot, Sr.

Ben Aloruk

Minnie Mayer

Tommy Ballot, Sr.

Levi Cleveland

Bob Foot

IRA:

Frank Adams, Sr.

Joe Murdy, President, AML

Senator John Torgerson



**CITY CLERK**  
POST OFFICE BOX 1397, KODIAK, ALASKA 99615

TELEPHONE (907) 486-8636  
FAX (907) 486-8600

February 20, 1996

Honorable John Torgerson  
Alaska State Senate  
State Capitol (MS 3100)  
Juneau, AK 99801-1183

Via FAX 907-486-4779

RE: CS for Sponsor Substitute for Senate Bill 20 (CRA)

Dear Senator Torgerson:

Mayor Floyd and the City Council support the referenced bill relating to certain programs of state aid to municipalities. Please convey Kodiak's position to the Senate Finance Committee.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

CITY OF KODIAK

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Marcella H. Dalke".

MARCELLA H. DALKE, CMC/AAE  
City Clerk

MHD/ms

cc: Senator Fred Zharoff  
Representative Alan Austerman



# **Kodiak Island Borough**

710 MILL BAY ROAD  
KODIAK, ALASKA 99615-6398

(907)486-9300

February 20, 1996

Senator John Torgerson, Chair  
Community & Regional Affairs Committee  
Room 427 State Capital  
Juneau AK 99801-1182

VIA FAX: 465-4779

Dear Senator Torgerson:

The Kodiak Island Borough heartily endorses the revised version of Senate Bill 20 for "Safe Communities" in Alaska. The changes made to SB 20 in the Revenue Sharing and Municipal Assistance Programs are critical to the continued viability of the municipalities throughout the state. In particular, the \$40,000 minimum funding will be a make-it or break-it level for the very small communities in rural Alaska, which have no other real funding source other than Municipal Assistance and Revenue Sharing. The concept of "Safe Communities" in maintaining viable rural communities is very important to Alaska. The fact that a number of these communities have dissolved in the past year, with several more dissolutions pending, and reports of 30 to 90 more considering dissolution, is a real warning bell for all of us.

Another strong feature of the bill is the accountability feature where the municipalities must inform the public what the money is used for, as well as requiring that the money be used for high priority public safety and safe community projects. Additionally, the feature allowing the distribution of the funding at the beginning of the fiscal year will enable communities to plan around the actual amount of funding, as opposed to guessing for part of the year, only to discover that the estimated figures fall short of planned expenditures which creates major obstacles to sound planning and budgeting for the municipalities.

I want to commend you for the outstanding work that you have done on SB 20 to bring us to this point and urge you and your colleagues to pass this bill into law this session so that we can bring some stability to the communities throughout the State of Alaska. Stable communities are critical to successfully plan for the fiscal changes that will be necessary to close the fiscal gap and bring Alaska into a strong healthy position going into the twenty-first century. If I can provide you with any additional information, please don't hesitate to give me a call.

Sincerely,

**KODIAK ISLAND BOROUGH**

Jerome M. Selby  
Borough Mayor

# City of Lower Kalskag

Lower Kalskag, AK 99574

(907) 471-2228

February 21, 1996

Dear Senator Tokgersen;

We the City of Lower Kalskag are supporting SB20 the Safe Communities bill. Our community is a member of the Alaska Municipal League, and we are united on this issue. We believe this is a good bill, we therefore support "Safe communities" Legislation- SB20.

Yago Evans  
Mayor

City of Ouzinkie  
P.O. Box 109  
Ouzinkie, AK 99644  
Ph# (907) 680-2209  
Fax (907) 680-2223

February 21, 1996

Senator John Torgerson  
State Capitol  
Juneau, AK 99811

Dear Senator Torgerson:

The City of Ouzinkie supports SB20 the Safe Communities Bill. Like many Alaskan Villages, or small cities with populations less than 1,000.00 and no revenue base, this bill if passed could save us from dissolving.

To many times Municipal Assistance is interpreted wrong or confused with welfare, which it is not, it is the communities share of Alaska's resources.

These monies are generally used for the Health and Safety of the people of the communities, without revenues from the State, the Public Safety Department does not have operating funds.

The amount of revenues allocated in SB20 will make a considerable difference for smaller communities to operate without impacting the larger cities.

As I said, before, we definitely support SB20 and ask the legislature to pass it, the bill makes allocation more equitable among municipalities.

Sincerely,

*Zack Chichenoff*

Zack Chichenoff  
Mayor



# CITY OF HOMER

CITY HALL

401 EAST PIONEER AVENUE

HOMER, AK 99603-7648

TELEPHONE (907) 226-0401  
TELECOPIER (907) 226-0140

21 February 1996

FAX 463-4779

Senator John Torgerson  
State Capital, Room 427  
Juneau, AK 99801-1182

RE: SB 20 - "SAFE COMMUNITIES"

Dear Senator Torgerson:

I support SB 20 - the "Safe Communities" bill. The concept of stable and predictable municipal revenue sharing is essential to long range community planning in Alaska.

Thank you for your support.

Sincerely,

CITY OF HOMER

Hugh R. Bevan  
Acting City Manager

HB/ah



**HAINES BOROUGH** Box 1209, Haines, Alaska 99827 (907) 768-2711 FAX 768-2710

February 20, 1996

Senator John Torgerson  
Alaska State Legislature  
State Capitol, Room  
Juneau, AK 99801-1182

Re: Letter of Support for SB 20 - "Safe Communities" Bill

Dear Senator Torgerson:

I am writing this letter in support of SB 20 - the revised "Safe Communities" Bill. It is my opinion that the passage of this bill will provide for the stabilizing and strengthening of our community along with many other communities in the state.

The Haines Borough does not want a reduction in funding for road maintenance, health care facilities, etc., so we strongly support Senate Bill 20, because it does not reduce this funding. We are pleased to know that this bill will not significantly reduce any community's funding, but make allocations more equitable among municipalities.

This bill directly ties state aid to public safety services which is one of the priorities of the citizens in our borough.

Thank you for your efforts on our behalf.

Sincerely,

Jerry L. Lapp, Mayor  
Haines Borough

JLL/jm

cc: Senator Zharoff  
Representative Mackie

Restored to the original  
Eagle City Hall,  
still currently in use.



One of the oldest  
incorporated cities in  
Greater Alaska,  
January 8, 1901



CITY OF EAGLE - BOX 100 - EAGLE, ALASKA 99720



February 19, 1996

TO: Senator Torgerson

FAX 465-4779

FROM: Elva Scott, Mayor  
Eagle City

*Elva Scott*

FAX 547-2232

SUBJECT: SB 20

We have just received the information regarding SB 20, the revised "Safe Communities" bill. I understand you are interested in learning the reaction of the smaller incorporated communities to this bill.

We would support SB 20. We have a property tax, but with only 146 residents, it is a real struggle just to provide fire protection and a source of safe water plus meeting unfunded mandates and federal mandates. Any assistance would be welcomed.

We like the name change from "Municipal Assistance" to "Safe Communities".



CITY & BOROUGH of YAKUTAT

P.O. Box 100

Yakutat, Alaska 99609

Phone (907) 784-3323

Fax (907) 784-3281

Sen John Torgerson

FAX (907) 465-4779

FEB. 28<sup>th</sup>, 1996

---

To let you know of my continuing support of SB20.

I was going to sign to speak the other day but it appeared the issue was well presented by Kevin and Joe and the others.

My only question is that defining "public safety" not be pigeon holed or tightly defined by a state agency.

Thanks for all the effort on this.

Tom Cronin  
Borough Mgr.



# City and Borough of Sitka

Marlene Campbell

Special Projects Officer

100 Lincoln Street • Sitka, Alaska 99835

TEL (907) 747-1855 FAX (907) 747-3158

# FAX

TO: Susette Tognone

COMPANY/AGENCY: State Seal

CITY: Juneau

FAX NO: 45 - 4779

FROM: Marlene Campbell for G. Landon

NUMBER OF PAGES INCLUDING THIS COVER SHEET: 2

MESSAGE: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

PHONE 747-1855 IMMEDIATELY IF NOT RECEIVED PROPERLY.

THANK YOU

DATE SENT: 2/2/01

TIME SENT: 4:58

PHONE FAX (907) 664-1111

JOE MURDY  
PML

JERRY WONGITTILIN SR.

CITY OF SAVOONGA

907-984-6411 984-6614

Here is the Support  
Letter for Sen. Torgerson.  
Thank you



# WALRUS CAPITAL OF THE WORLD SAVOONGA, ALASKA



CITY OF SAVOONGA  
P.O. BOX 97  
SAVOONGA ALASKA 99709  
PHONE 984-6614

FEB. 16, 1996

SENATOR JOHN TORGERSON  
STATE CAPITOL  
JUNEAU, AK 99811

DEAR SENATOR TORGERSON,

ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF SAVOONGA, I AM WRITING TO SUPPORT SB 20,  
THE NEW SAFE COMMUNITIES BILL. WE BELIEVE THIS LEGISLATION WILL GO  
A LONG WAY TO LET PEOPLE KNOW HOW IMPORTANT THIS MONEY IS TO  
SMALL CITIES.

WE ESPECIALLY SUPPORT THE PROVISION TO RAISE THE MINIMUM TO  
\$40,000.00. IT TAKES EVEN MORE THAN THAT TO KEEP OUR DOORS OPEN,  
BUT THIS WILL CERTAINLY HELP.

THANK YOU FOR SPONSORING THIS BILL AND FOR HELPING TO SAVE SMALL  
CITIES IN THE RURAL ALASKA.

SINCERELY,

JERRY WONGITTILIN SR.  
MAYOR

# ALEUTIANS EAST BOROUGH

SERVING THE COMMUNITIES OF  
■ KING COVE ■ SAND POINT ■ AKUTAN ■ COLD BAY ■ FALSE PASS ■ NELSON LAGOON

February 16, 1998

Sen. John Torgerson  
Room 427  
State Capitol  
Juneau, AK 99801-1162

RE: SB 20 - "Safe Communities" Bill

Dear Sen. Torgerson:

The Aleutians East Borough Assembly is pleased to offer our support of your endeavors on behalf of SB 20 and we thank you for your energetic support of this important legislation.

The term "Municipal Assistance" tends to be confused with a "giveaway program" rather than our communities' share of Alaska's resources, and the Aleutians East Borough agrees with changing the program title to "Safe Communities". This term implies support of important and needed services in our communities. We strongly support the direct public safety expenditures that this bill will provide under its new title.

Distribution of the funding under this bill should occur near the beginning of the State fiscal year (July 31) when it is appropriated, rather than the following February. We understand funding will not be significantly reduced for any community, and will in fact, make allocations more equitable among municipalities.

For the above reasons, we hereby offer our comments in support of SB 20, the "Safe Communities" Legislation. If we can be of further assistance, please let us know.

Sincerely,



Robert S. Justner  
Borough Administrator

CLERK/PLANNER  
P.O. BOX 349  
SAND POINT, ALASKA 99881  
(907) 363-2888  
(907) 363-3488 FAX

BOROUGH ADMINISTRATOR  
1650 A STREET, SUITE 100  
NICHOLS, ALASKA 99841-0140  
(907) 274-7555  
(907) 275-7555 FAX

FINANCE DIRECTOR  
P.O. BOX 49  
KING COVE, ALASKA 99812  
(907) 487-2188  
(907) 487-2288 FAX



# CITY OF BETHEL

P.O. Box 388 Bethel, Alaska 99568  
907-543-2287  
FAX # 543-4171

February 21, 1996

Mr. Kevin C. Ritchie  
Executive Director  
Alaska Municipal League  
217 Second Street, Suite 200  
Juneau, AK 99801

Dear Kevin:

The City Council of Bethel, at their February 13, 1996 regular meeting, adopted a Resolution in support of the "Safe Communities" legislation. This resolution was drafted and adopted before the Fax Alert from AML regarding Senate Bill 20, so it simply refers to "the AML's Revenue Sharing for Safe Communities Program." I have faxed the resolution to Senator Torgerson.

The vote in favor of this Resolution was unanimous, and a copy is enclosed for your records.

Sincerely,

L.J. Tanner  
City Clerk



# CITY OF BETHEL

P.O. Box 388 Bethel, Alaska 99560

907-543-2287

FAX # 543-4171

Introduced by: Council Member MIDer

Date: February 13, 1996

Action: Passed

Vote: 6-Yes, 0-No

## RESOLUTION #96-6

### **A RESOLUTION PROTESTING DECREASES IN THE STATE'S MUNICIPAL ASSISTANCE AND REVENUE SHARING, AFFIRMING SUPPORT FOR THE AML'S "REVENUE SHARING FOR SAFE COMMUNITIES" PROGRAM, AND URGING ITS ADOPTION.**

**WHEREAS**, municipal governments provide well over half of all direct government services to the citizens of Alaska; and

**WHEREAS**, the state has steadily raised local municipal taxes over the past ten years by disproportionately reducing municipal government's share of Alaska's oil wealth and indirectly mandating state service responsibilities to municipal governments; and

**WHEREAS**, the Local Boundary Commission found that cities and boroughs are "penalized" by the state for incorporating because the state has withdrawn revenues and services promised at the time of incorporation; and

**WHEREAS**, in rural municipalities, revenue sharing is critical to maintaining the most basic public safety and health services; and

**WHEREAS**, according to the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, in 1993 the average state government contribution to local government revenues was 34.8% in the entire U.S., and 48.1 % in the Far West States, including Alaska. The average state support to municipal governments in Alaska is 36.5% despite Alaska's extremely wide variation in local wealth and taxable resources; and

**WHEREAS**, the SAFE COMMUNITIES program is a rational method of implementing the state's Long Range Financial Plan, and

**WHEREAS**, the major goals of the SAFE COMMUNITIES program are to:

1. **Stabilize the revenue sharing money to our communities. Under the proposed program, the state revenue sharing appropriation would never be less than 8% of the state operating budget. This compromise will show that municipalities are willing to help balance the state budget, but not shoulder a disproportionate share. (In the past ten years, MA/RS has been cut by over 85% while the state operating budget has stayed about the same.) Stability for funding revenue sharing is the primary goal of the AML/ACoM.**
2. **Consolidate and simplify the Municipal Assistance and Revenue Sharing statutes.**
3. **Prove that all the money is spent for critical municipal basic public services.**
4. **Ensure that our communities get a fair share now and in the future. (The proposed changes eliminate "winner and loser" communities)**

City of Bethel  
Ordinance #96-6  
Page 1 of 2 Pages


*"Deep Sea Port and Transportation Center of the Kuskokwim"*

Introduced by: Council Member Miller  
Date: February 13, 1996  
Action: Passed  
Vote: 6-Yes, 0-No


8. Set a \$40,000 minimum funding level for incorporated communities.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE BETHEL CITY COUNCIL URGES  
THE LEGISLATURE TO ADOPT THE "REVENUE SHARING FOR SAFE COMMUNITIES"  
PROGRAM.

PASSED AND APPROVED THIS 15TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 1996.

  
Ruth M. Richardson, Mayor

ATTEST:

  
L.J. Tanner, City Clerk

# DENALI BOROUGH

P.O. Box 480 • Healy, Alaska 99743  
Phone (907) 883-1330 • FAX (907) 883-1340



John C. Gonzales, Mayor  
P.O. Box 3137  
Anderson, AK 99744  
(907) 523-2346

February 20, 1996

Senator John Torgerson  
Alaska Municipal League  
217 Second St., STE#200  
Juneau, AK 99801

RE: Supporting SB 20 - the "Safe Communities" Bill.

Dear John,


Please consider this letter as support of SB 20, - the Safe Communities Bill. I find that this bill is far better than the bill that was presented last year.

By trying to keep municipalities all equal, no losers, I feel it would make all municipalities agreeable to the contents of the bill. The distributions of all of the funds near the beginning of the State fiscal year is very appealing.

I know you will probably get support of this bill from most of the municipalities, and will probably hear the same issues over and over again, I will make my support short. If I may be of any help to you please contact me at my office at any time.

Yours in better government,

John C. Gonzales  
Mayor



# City of Port Lions

Administrative Offices

P.O. Box 110

Port Lions, AK 99550-0110

(907) 454-2332 (Fax) 454-2420

February 16, 1996

Mr. Joe Murdy, President  
Alaska Municipal League  
217 Second Street, Suite 200  
Juneau, Alaska 99801

RE: Letter of support for SB 20

RECEIVED  
FEB 20 1996  
ALASKA MUNICIPAL LEAGUE

Dear Mr. Murdy,

The City of Port Lions strongly supports Senator John Torgerson's efforts in passing SB 20.

Throughout the past few years our communities Municipal Assistance has been reduced drastically. By changing the name of Municipal Assistance to Safe Communities we feel the funding will not be confused with welfare or a type of "give away funding", but in fact make it more clear to those that do not understand that it is our communities share of Alaska's resources that ALL communities are entitled to receive.

With the funding being cut by 60% over the past ten years, the City of Port Lions supports the assured minimum funding level of \$40,000 that this bill provides. It cannot continue to be cut year after year by even another small percentage and be able, nor expected to continue providing safe programs that significantly impacts each and every one of our community members.

We also support the idea of receiving our municipalities funding near the beginning of the States fiscal year instead of the following February. This is not only the practical thing to do but is the most sensible as our fiscal year also begins in July.

**We cannot stress enough the importance in the passing of SB 20. The impact will tremendously help not only Port Lions, but all the small communities throughout the great State of Alaska.**

**We appreciate anything you can do to help pass this much needed Senate Bill.**

**If you need further information on why we would like to see the passage of this Bill, please feel free to give me a call at your convenience.**

**Thank you for your assistance on this important issue.**

**Sincerely,**



**PORT LIONS CITY COUNCIL**  
**Robert Himes, Mayor**

**cc: Governor Knowles**  
**Senator Zharoff**  
**Rep. Austerman**  
**Kodiak Island Borough Mayor Selby**

February 21, 1996

Mr. Kevin C. Ritchie  
Executive Director  
Alaska Municipal League  
217 Second Street, Suite 200  
Juneau, AK 99801

Dear Kevin:

The City Council of Bethel, at their February 13, 1996 regular meeting, adopted a Resolution in support of the "Safe Communities" legislation. This resolution was drafted and adopted before the Fax Alert from AML regarding Senate Bill 20, so it simply refers to "the AJAL's Revenue Sharing for Safe Communities Program." I have faxed the resolution to Senator Torgerson.

The vote in favor of this Resolution was unanimous, and a copy is enclosed for your records.

Sincerely,

L.J. Tanner  
City Clerk

# City of Sand Point



February 16, 1996

Senator John Torgerson  
Chairman, Community and Regional Affairs  
State of Alaska  
State capitol  
Room 427  
Juneau, Alaska 99801-1182

RE: SB 20 Safe Communities

Dear Senator Torgerson,

As a past local elected official and past president of the Alaska Municipal League, you personally are very aware of the continuing problems local governments faced every fiscal year.

Over the past several years, Municipal Assistance and Revenue Sharing have been reduced by over 60% which has placed an enormous burden on local government to pick up the slack. Very few communities have been able to bear the full burden without reducing the level of services they provide regardless of how basic.

The City of Sand Point, being a one industry town, fishing, is in the same plight as many other communities whereby the level of services has been greatly reduced. Further reduction in state shared revenues will necessitate the elimination of jobs and reduction of the level of service to minimal at the most.

CS for CSSB 20 is a bill which we support because of the early funding and the requirement that it be used for essential services such as public safety. Being a full service community as well as a community whose livelihood is predicated upon the fishing industry, we feel this bill will assist in our needs of a timely cash flow during our peak periods.

The City of Sand Point supports CS for CSSB 20 and particularly your efforts as well as the Community and Regional Affairs Committee to hear


City Office:  
P.O. Box 249  
Sand Point, Alaska 99661  
(907) 383-2696

Administrator:  
1600 A Street, Suite 108  
Anchorage, Alaska 99501-5146  
(907) 274-7555 Phone  
(907) 274-7559 FAX

the voices from the wilderness on such an important matter to all the municipalities in the State.

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

Yours truly,

  
Alvin D. Osterback  
Mayor



**City of Point Hope**

**P.O. Box 189**

**Point Hope, Alaska 99761**

**368-2537**

**FACSIMILE COVER SHEET**

**DATE:** 2/21/96

**TIME:** \_\_\_\_\_

**TO:** \_\_\_\_\_

**ATTN:** Joe Murdy, President AMU

**NO. OF PAGES:** 3 **INCLUDING THIS COVERSHEET**

**FAH NO.:** 463-5480

**SUBJECT:** Safe Communities

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

.....

**We are transmitting from a Alcoh FAX 25. Please call 368-2537 if you did not receive all the pages.**

**JM:** Ray Koonuk Jr.

**FAH NO:** 368-2835

**FORM REVISED: 4/19/93**



## **City of Point Hope**

**P.O. Box 189  
Point Hope, Alaska 99708  
302-6537**

February 15, 1996

Honorable, Governor Tony Knowles

Governor: Tony Knowles  
P.O. Box 110001  
Juneau, Ak 99811-0001

Dear Governor Knowles,

During your last live Alaskan talk show on ARCS, I asked you a question about the State's Revenue and Municipal Assistance program. I understand that you support an 8% cut on both state and municipal revenues for 96-97 and that there have been talk of even higher cuts to these programs in the legislature. I don't believe that cities can sustain even these cuts at this time.

As you know the City governments are having serious problems adapting to the state cuts in the past few years. We are also experiencing cuts on the federal level and locally through the boroughs. The result is substantially less revenues to operate city services.

During the past year, five city governments have dissolved. I am really concerned that the continuing cuts are threatening the existence of city governments and city services in many villages throughout Alaska.

One of the most commonly used private sector economic terms of the past few years has been downsizing. Corporations have found ways to squeeze profits out of their services by cutting the number of employees. Termination and release has become a much more common experience in recent years for middle management and production employees. This is a dangerous trend but the levels are minimal compared to the levels of unemployment that villages have continuously experienced.

Therefore, I cannot support a planned 8% cut in the Municipal Assistance and Revenue Sharing plans. I must demand that the state attempt to hold the line without further cuts to the municipal governments at this time. To do otherwise means completely disproportionate impacts from the cuts in rural villages.

Sincerely,

Mr. Ray Kosnuk, Sr. Mayor  
c.c. Alaskan mayors

**North and Northwest Mayor's**

**Sen. Al Adams**

**Rep. Don Long**

**NSB Mayor: George Ahmaogak**

**Lon Sonsalla**

**Enoch Oktolik**

**Herman Kignak**

**Michael Neakok, Sr.**

**Paul Hugo**

**NW Mayors: Miles Cleveland, Sr.**

**Willie Thomas**

**Gilbert S. Barr**

**Oscar Sage, Sr.**

**Frank Greene**

**Lee Ballot, Sr.**

**Ben Aloruk**

**Minnie Mayer**

**Tommy Ballot, Sr.**

**Levi Cleveland**

**Bob Foot**

**IRA: Frank Adams, Sr.**

**Joe Murdy, President, AML**

**Senator John Torgerson**



# City and Borough of Sitka

100 LINCOLN STREET • SITKA, ALASKA 99835

February 20, 1996

Senator John Torgerson, Chair  
Community and Regional Affairs Committee  
Alaska State Senate  
FAX. 465-4779

Dear Senator Torgerson and Community and Regional Affairs Committee:

The City and Borough of Sitka supports Senate Bill 20, the revised "Safe Communities" bill. This bill provides for greater equity and better use of Municipal Assistance funds. Sitka strongly supports distribution of all funds to municipalities early in the fiscal year. This bill is a "win-win" that will strengthen municipalities.

Your support for passing this bill out of Committee will be greatly appreciated. We especially appreciate Senator Torgerson's past support on this bill.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

  
Gary L. Paxton  
Administrator

cc: Alaska Municipal League  
Senator Taylor  
Representative Grussendorf



# City of False Pass

P.O. Box 50 • False Pass, Alaska 99583-0050  
Telephone (907) 548-2319 • Fax (907) 548-2214

Post-It™ brand fax transmittal memo 7671		# of pages > 1
To Joe Mundy, AMC	From Elizabeth Maudslayi	
Ca	Ca For your information	
Dept.	Phone #	
Fax #	Fax #	

February 16, 1996

Senator John Torgerson  
State Capitol, Room 427  
Juneau, Alaska 99801-1182

Dear Honorable Torgerson:

The City of False Pass would like to express its support for SB 29-the "Safe Communities" Bill. This bill addresses methods to make the former Municipal Assistance program more equitable to municipalities by allowing equitable proration. This bill also helps curb the impetus for smaller municipalities to dissolve as continued funding cuts have rendered them unable to provide public services.

The City of False Pass relies on the Municipal Assistance payment to fund the Volunteer Fire Department and the Emergency Medical Response Team which are the only such services available locally. The Safe Communities Payment would also be used to supplement water and landfill services which are not supported with user fees. Local revenue source is derived from sales tax which fluctuates annually according to fishing income. Local revenue has declined steadily in relation to new fishing regulations. Local revenue cannot continue to support basic public services without additional "safe Communities" assistance.

We appreciate your continued support of SB 20. The proposed changes allow the City of False Pass to remain a second class city providing basic public services and to provide a healthy and safe environment to all its residents.

Sincerely,

Borge Larsen  
Mayor

Nancy E. Canington  
P. O. Box 28  
Unalakleet, Alaska 99684

742

February 26, 1996

Senator John Torgerson  
State Capitol, Rm. 427  
Juneau, Alaska 99801-1182

Dear Senator Torgerson:

Senate Bill 20, the "Safe Communities" Bill, is most urgently needed in order for small Alaskan villages to survive. As a member of the Local Boundary Commission I am very concerned that we are seeing so many requests for information on dissolution. As these small communities are allowed to dissolve, certain obligations and liabilities are still going to be the responsibility of the State. If these communities can continue to operate as small cities with the assistance of "Safe Communities" funds, then why do we face such opposition from the legislature? Common sense dictates that old adage that "You can pay now, or you can pay later". I urge you not to let it be later.

One other distressing comment that I heard during the first hearing on SB20 on Wednesday, February 14, was Sen. Kelly's statement that he always considered the education funding as Municipal Assistance and Revenue Sharing toward the total community contribution. In areas of the State outside organized boroughs, the local communities never see the education funding because it is handled through the REAA for each area. Our municipal funds received through MARS are used to provide the safety for our communities.

In Unalakleet, our police department receives no other funding other than what little is collected for protective custodies, yet it is necessary to run a full-time police department! How would you like to live in a community without police protection? In the seven years that I have been manager here, our police department has been cut from 6 full-time officers to three with utilization of a VPSO to cover for the fourth position. They work four 10-hour days on, four off. That is one officer, working alone. There are four hours of each 24 hour period that we have no officer on duty because we just cannot afford it. We utilize special officers (those with limited or only on-the-job training) because burnout creates turnover before we can send them to the trooper academy for training.

The legislature continue to cut, cut, cut, and pass it on to the municipalities. The end result is that the smaller communities are looking at dissolving (or just quit operating), cities in organized boroughs are looking to detach, and organized boroughs are having an increasingly hard time justifying the taxes vs. services they are able to provide. Yet the

legislature continues to assume that they are doing an excellent job as long as they can balance the State's budget on the backs of local governments through cuts.

With the State facing continuing declining revenues, I feel it is time for the legislature to approach utilizing the interest earnings on the Permanent Fund to balance the budget. Just how rainy does it have to get before we reap some benefits from this "Rainy Day Account"? I am certainly not advocating a raid on the principal, but it would never have to be touched. When we talk to people from other states about our budget woes they laugh at us because we have this roughly 19 billion dollar fund!

I do hope the legislature will act responsibly and pass SB20 to show some support for the grassroots governments that provide the services to the legislators' constituents. Thank you, Sen. Torgerson, for having the foresight to sponsor this Bill.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Nancy E. Carrington". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned to the right of the typed name.

Nancy E. Carrington

Joe Murdy, President  
Alaska Municipal League,  
217 Second Street  
Suite 200  
Juneau, Alaska 99801

RECEIVED  
FEB 23 1996  
ALASKA MUNICIPAL LEAGUE

February 22, 1996

Dear Joe,

I am writing to support Senator Torgerson in SB 20 bill - the "Safe Communities" bill. Which would change the program title from Municipal Assistance to "Safe Communities". This would let the public know how important services are supported by the funds. Also the public strongly supports direct public safety expenditures and requires accountability. And the "Safe Communities" program, retains the former two allocation formulas, but makes the program more equitable by allowing equitable proration. And funding for "Safe Communities" and "Priority Revenue Sharing for Municipal Services" will be distributed close to the beginning of the state fiscal year (on July 31) to: provide municipalities with more flexibility, and; end the practice of the state holding part of the funds until mid fiscal year. I would like to emphasize that the city of Dismal strongly supports the SB 20 bill.

*Helen Iyapana*  
Helen Iyapana, Treasurer

## ACoM and AML MUNICIPAL SURVEY

(Please take a few minutes to complete and return ASAP by FAX to 463-5400)

Municipality Kotlik Completed by Rose Cheemuk - City Manager

1. Since 1985, have state cuts in Municipal Assistance/ Revenue Sharing and other municipal aid programs, transfers of state service responsibilities, unfunded mandates, and underfunding state programs (such as schools), been a major factor in local:

a. tax or fee increases?  No  Yes, if yes, please give examples:

b. service cutbacks.  No  Yes, if yes, please give examples:

The City office cut back on the hours that the office usually opens.

also the maintenance man's hours were cut.

2. If the state continues the trends described in question 1, what do you feel the impacts on your community will be over the next several years:

The City office may have to lessen all the employees hours if there is more cuts.

3. Since 1985, in addition to sales and property taxes, has your municipality had to implement other taxes or fees to maintain services?  No  Yes, the most significant are:

4. Describe something your municipality accomplished that you are especially proud of especially over the past year or so. For example, a new program to promote community economic growth, or a way to do more with less.

Since the cut backs other organizations have assisted alot and the organizations are working together.

5. In a sentence, summarize the message you would like to give the state regarding municipal government. Further cut backs on the municipal assistance and state revenue sharing will cause hardship for the local government and the community. The cuts will affect the police force also in the village. The public depends alot on the local government.

**THANK YOU,** from the Alaska Conference of Mayors and Alaska Municipal League  
City of Kotlik, Alaska

## ACoM and AML MUNICIPAL SURVEY

(Please take a few minutes to complete and return ASAP by FAX to 463-5481)

Municipality City of Bethel

Completed by Mayor Ruth Richardson

1. Since 1985, have state cuts in Municipal Assistance/ Revenue Sharing and other municipal aid programs, transfers of state service responsibilities, unfunded mandates, and underfunding state programs (such as schools), been a major factor in local:

a. tax or fee increases?  No  Yes, if yes, please give examples:

b. service cutbacks?  No  Yes, if yes, please give examples:

It is very difficult to keep up with the services needed by our growing population, i.e.,  
water, sewer, police, fire, roads.

2. If the state continues the trends described in question 1, what do you feel the impacts on your community will be over the next several years:

Increases in the Sales Tax

Degradation of Roads and Public Services

Severe impact on the Bethel Bank Stabilization Project, which may result in further  
loss of riverbank, homes, and roads.

3. Since 1985, in addition to sales and property taxes, has your municipality had to implement other taxes or fees to maintain services?  No  Yes, the most significant are:

Fuel through-out Tax on all fuel crossing the seawall.

4. Describe something your municipality accomplished that you are especially proud of, especially over the past year or so. For example, a new program to promote community economic growth, or a way to do more with less.

The City privatized the operations of the Laundromat.

5. In a sentence, summarize the message you would like to give the state regarding municipal government.

Seriously look at other areas of the State Government for cutbacks before cutting  
Municipal Assistance and Revenue Sharing.

**THANK YOU, from the Alaska Conference of Mayors and Alaska Municipal League**

Ketchikan - Alaine Stanton

\$8 million port dock

done in a year

cooperate with NW (missed) State/City  
bond. partnership - benefit all  
no local taxes

"A lot of what we do is just  
survive."

## ACoM and AML MUNICIPAL SURVEY

(Please take a few minutes to complete and return ASAP by FAX to 463-9480)

Municipality Katchikan Completed by Robert E. Newell, Jr. Finance Director

1. Since 1985, have state cuts in Municipal Assistance/ Revenue Sharing and other municipal aid programs, transfers of state service responsibilities, unfunded mandates, and underfunding state programs (such as schools), been a major factor in local:

a. tax or fee increases?  No  Yes. If yes, please give examples:

b. service cutbacks.  No  Yes. If yes, please give examples:

Capital improvement program has been scaled back significantly

2. If the state continues the trends described in question 1, what do you feel the impacts on your community will be over the next several years:

Property and/or sales tax increases

3. Since 1985, in addition to sales and property taxes, has your municipality had to implement other taxes or fees to maintain services?  No  Yes, the most significant are:

Solid waste disposal fees and harbor user fees

4. Describe something your municipality accomplished that you are especially proud of, especially over the past year or so. For example, a new program to promote community economic growth, or a way to do more with less.

Expanded the Port of Katchikan in 1994 to further promote growth in our tourism industry

5. In a sentence, summarize the message you would like to give the state regarding municipal government.

State government's efforts to contain its operating costs and balance its budget should not be done at the expense of local municipalities.

**THANK YOU**, from the Alaska Conference of Mayors and Alaska Municipal League

C:\bvt\man\1994\surv.doc

## ACoM and AML MUNICIPAL SURVEY

(Please take a few minutes to complete and return ASAP by FAX to 463-5480)

Municipality Hoonah Completed by Robert Pinard, Ass't. Adm./Treasurer

1. Since 1985, have state cuts in Municipal Assistance/ Revenue Sharing and other municipal aid programs, transfers of state service responsibilities, unfunded mandates, and underfunding state programs (such as schools), been a major factor in local:

a. tax or fee increases?  No  Yes, if yes, please give examples:

b. service cutbacks.  No  Yes, if yes, please give examples:

The City of Hoonah has reduced Public Works, Police and General Operation Personnel to the extent that it has reduced the quality of service and protection we are able to provide.

2. If the state continues the trends described in question 1, what do you feel the impacts on your community will be over the next several years: Continued reduction of service and protection. Like most predominantly native communities they do not feel they should support government service through increased taxes.

3. Since 1985, in addition to sales and property taxes, has your municipality had to implement other taxes or fees to maintain services?  No  Yes, the most significant are: We have attempted on ty: occasions to raise sales taxes. Because of the problem with restricted deeds and HUD Housing a property tax is not equitable in this community.

4. Describe something your municipality accomplished that you are especially proud of, especially over the past year or so. For example, a new program to promote community economic growth, or a way to do more with less. Municipally, to do more with less and still be able to operate the City in the Black.

5. In a sentence, summarize the message you would like to give the state regarding municipal government. Please do not pass the state problems on to communities that are predominantly native. As stated above they feel government owes them not them owing government.

**THANK YOU**, from the Alaska Conference of Mayors and Alaska Municipal League  
C:\havin\acm\1990\1990.doc

### ACoM and AML MUNICIPAL SURVEY

(Please take a few minutes to complete and return ASAP by FAX to 463-5480)

Municipality: Old Harbor Completed by Jonette Crouty - City Clerk

1. Since 1985, have state cuts in Municipal Assistance/ Revenue Sharing and other municipal aid programs, transfers of state service responsibilities, unfunded mandates, and underfunding state programs (such as schools), been a major factor in local:

a. tax or fee increases? No  Yes, if yes, please give examples:

b. service cutbacks. No  Yes, if yes, please give examples:

Sales Tax 3%

Cut back with City Employees

Eliminated Garage Pick-up

2. If the state continues the trends described in question 1, what do you feel the impacts on your community will be over the next several years:

The city of Old Harbor is operating with the bare minimum budget. A reduction would be devastating.

3. Since 1985, in addition to sales and property taxes, has your municipality had to implement other taxes or fees to maintain services? No  Yes, the most significant are:

Water / Sewer Fees

Boat Harbors fees

4. Describe something your municipality accomplished that you are especially proud of, especially over the past year or so. For example, a new program to promote community economic growth, or a way to do more with less.

Begin construction of the new Fire Hall Building.

5. In a sentence, summarize the message you would like to give the state regarding municipal government. It's essential to the economic growth & development of the community.

THANK YOU, from the Alaska Conference of Mayors and Alaska Municipal League

### ACoM and AML MUNICIPAL SURVEY

(Please take a few minutes to complete and return ASAP by FAX to 463-5400)

Municipality Uta Village Completed by NAPOL P Myre

1. Since 1985, have state cuts in Municipal Assistance/ Revenue Sharing and other municipal aid programs, transfers of state service responsibilities, unfunded mandates and underfunding state programs (such as schools), been a major factor in local:

- a. tax or fee increases?  No  Yes, if yes, please give examples:
- b. service cutbacks.  No  Yes, if yes, please give examples:

Police Dept Cut in wages and hence have to depend on dispatchers at a lower wage.

2. If the state continues the trends described in question 1, what do you feel the impacts on your community will be over the next several years: Water/sewer

Services will become harder to maintain. Pressure will be on the residence both local businesses. Police Dept will be almost impossible to finance.

3. Since 1985, in addition to sales and property taxes, has your municipality had to implement other taxes or fees to maintain services?  No  Yes, the most significant are:

4. Describe something your municipality accomplished that you are especially proud of, especially over the past year or so. For example, a new program to promote community economic growth, or a way to do more with less.

We have begun to acquire Insurance through AML JIA. Great this is a big accomplishment for Uta Village

5. In a sentence, summarize the message you would like to give the state regarding municipal government.

Any more cutbacks will be hard on our community. Had to be self sufficient when there is no money around. Whether it is state, just or state best to the individual.

THANK YOU, from the Alaska Conference of Mayors and Alaska Municipal League  
C:\data\exam\1999\muni.sur

# ACoM and AML MUNICIPAL SURVEY

(Please take a few minutes to complete and return ASAP by FAX to 463-5480)

Municipality Nome Completed by Jumbo Cooley - City Clerk & Yvonne Washell - City Commissioner

1. Since 1985, have state cuts in Municipal Assistance/ Revenue Sharing and other municipal aid programs, transfers of state service responsibilities, unfunded mandates and underfunding state programs (such as schools), been a major factor in local:

- a. tax or fee increases? No  Yes, if yes, please give examples:  
b. service cutbacks. No  Yes, if yes, please give examples:

Which decreased state money, property taxes have been increased. City of Nome initiated 47c bid tax. We induce tax on small tax tables. Our Museum was closed and will open on a 10 month basis.

2. If the state continues the trends described in question 1, what do you feel the impacts on your community will be over the next several years: We will be required

to increase taxes as needs continue. School facilities like public works, etc. We are also being required to provide ambulance service for although the price is inflated by valuation, the price has increased.

3. Since 1985, in addition to sales and property taxes, has your municipality had to implement other taxes or fees to maintain services? No  Yes, the most significant are:

47c Bid Tax initiated  
Sales tax increased from 37c to 47c. Beer machine /  
ATV license raised from \$5 to \$25

4. Describe something your municipality accomplished that you are especially proud of, especially over the past year or so. For example, a new program to promote community economic growth, or a way to do more with less.

Completion of the Child Care building (and we are in local tax money expended and now in use for benefit of the children in the community)

5. In a sentence, summarize the message you would like to give the state regarding municipal government. Stop passing on regulations that mandate

additional time, material, money, duplication etc. to municipalities unless you fund the compliance involved.

THANK YOU, from the Alaska Conference of Mayors and Alaska Municipal League  
Chairman: [Name]

RECEIVED  
FEB 20 1991  
ALASKA MUNICIPAL LEAGUE

# ACOM and AML MUNI

(Please take a few minutes to complete and)

Municipality \_\_\_\_\_ Completed by \_\_\_\_\_

1. Since 1985, have there cuts in Municipal Assistance, municipal aid programs, transfers of state services and underfunding state programs (such as school)?
- a. tax or fee increases?  No
- b. service cutbacks.  No

No, not yet

2. If the state continues the trends described in question 1, what do you feel the on your community will be over the next several years? \_\_\_\_\_

If they aren't going to fund local governments then they need to let local governments have more authority to conduct fund raising on their own, such as raising the prize payout limits for municipal run gaming activities. Let communities decide on their own how much gaming is too much for their community. We only allow bingo evenings if there is no school the next day.

3. Since 1985, in addition to sales and property taxes, has your municipality had implemented other taxes or fees to maintain services?  No  Yes, the ones are: \_\_\_\_\_

The City of Teller has been involved in gaming a couple of different times since 1985. Lately we started again in 1994. In 1995 we were able to raise about \$160,000 through this method, which we have used to pay off past debts and support other basic city services.

4. Describe something your municipality accomplished that you are especially proud of especially over the past year or so. For example, a new program to promote economic growth, or a way to do more with less.

When I became Mayor in December of 1993 the City was on the brink of collapse due to poor management. We instituted the DCRA model accounting system, started operating our own bingo/pulltaba permit to benefit city operations, and began a PR campaign emphasizing collection of the accounts receivable in order to keep our city clean. Everyone that has traveled bush Alaska much comments on how clean it is in Teller. We rescheduled our debt payments, survived a couple of IRS liens, and took over the funding for the annual Christmas Holiday events. Stability at the top has attracted some competent office staff, we have a water & sewer feasibility study going on, funding for phase 1 is in the current capital budget, a reindeer slaughterhouse should be built this summer with a COBG grant.

5. In a sentence, summarize the message you would like to give the state regarding municipal government. \_\_\_\_\_

Most of us have a greater concern about our environment than any agency could possibly regulate. There are some regulations that don't make sense in our rural settings that cost a great deal to meet. Don't make us have to meet them unless the state is willing to pick up the tab for it. One of the biggest problems is finding competent personnel. Funding for schools in rural areas is woefully inadequate. Where is the next generation of leaders going to come from? I hope that this fiscal year we will be able to develop a pay scale for our employees that is comparable to the private sector in order to keep attracting quality workers. And we need the

## ACOM and AML MUNICIPAL SURVEY

(Please take a few minutes to complete and return ASAP by FAX to 463-5480)

Municipality CHUATHBALUK Completed by Stava Bennis - Mayor

1. Since 1985, have state cuts in Municipal Assistance/ Revenue Sharing and other municipal aid programs, transfers of state service responsibilities, unfunded mandates, and underfunding state programs (such as schools), been a major factor in local:

a. tax or fee increases? No Yes, if yes, please give examples:

b. service cutbacks. No XI Yes, if yes, please give examples:

Municipal Assc./Rev. Sharing cuts have resulted in less hours budgeted for our City Clerk and Maintenance Man. As a result of cuts we've also eliminated the City's sales of home heating fuel, gasoline and propane. Also the City has had to stop hauling honeybucket service and leave it up to residents.

2. If the state continues the trends described in question 1, what do you feel the impacts on your community will be over the next several years: #1) Job loss for a City Clerk and hours cut on Maintenance Man, #2) Loss of the ability for our City to function properly as a 2nd class city and exist in name only, #3) Our community will seriously look at withdrawing it's membership in AML and existing as an IRA council and propose existing with its own council and judicial system.

3. Since 1985, in addition to sales and property taxes, has your municipality had to implement other taxes or fees to maintain services? No XI Yes, the most significant are: Increase cost of city provided services in all areas for community residents such as laundromat fee's, equipment rentals and to cease sanitation service of honeybucket hauling and leave it up to the residents.

4. Describe something your municipality accomplished that you are especially proud of, especially over the past year or so. For example, a new program to promote community economic growth, or a way to do more with less.

Our Municipality funding has been cut so drastically that our services are now in "bare-bones" existence. Frankly, there isn't any accomplishment recently we can look upon with pride and in fact there is an over-riding feeling of resentment and reconsideration of seeking alternative forms of community government.

5. In a sentence, summarize the message you would like to give the state regarding municipal government. Rural communities and cities in Alaska have been slowly strangled by regular assistance and Revenue Sharing cutbacks resulting in continuous functional decreases and name only existence. There is a real danger of cities looking at alternative forms of government.

**THANK YOU**, from the Alaska Conference of Mayors and Alaska Municipal League  
C:\hr\acrom\1987rev.doc

## ACoM and AML MUNICIPAL SURVEY

(Please take a few minutes to complete and return ASAP by FAX to 463-5488)

Municipality CITY OF PALMER Completed by HENRY P. GUIDOTTE

1. Since 1985, have state cuts in Municipal Assistance/ Revenue Sharing and other municipal aid programs, transfers of state service responsibilities, unfunded mandates, and underfunding state programs (such as schools), been a major factor in local:

a. tax or fee increases? No  Yes, if yes, please give examples:

b. service cutbacks. No  Yes, if yes, please give examples:

The city sales tax was increased from 2% to 3%. We have increased fees for water hookups, building inspections, airport leases, airport sign down, utility services. WE have cut five employees, public works 2, library 2, accounting 1. We have delayed street repairs. We have cut library hours.

2. If the state continues the trends described in question 1, what do you feel the impacts on your community will be over the next several years: \_\_\_\_\_

We will need to increase local taxes. We can't cut much more and be a viable city. We feel we are down to minimums. Population is increasing with the demand for more services. Federal mandates have taken money from other local projects. The senior tax exemption decreases funding

3. Since 1985, in addition to sales and property taxes, has your municipality had to implement other taxes or fees to maintain services? No  Yes, the most significant are: Fees as listed above

4. Describe something your municipality accomplished that you are especially proud of, especially over the past year or so. For example, a new program to promote community economic growth, or a way to do more with less.

We continue to support the office of Palmer Economic development. We have used private money to add to soft ball fields. Business have landscaped and added other things re summer beautification. The Lions Club purchased costly holiday lights for the city and repaired existing ones.

5. In a sentence, summarize the message you would like to give the state regarding municipal government. PLEASE DON'T BALANCE THE STATE BUDGET IN A WAY THAT WILL INCREASE THE LOCAL TAXES. We will start a public information series to alert the voters to the reason for the increase in taxes and the reduced city services.

**THANK YOU**, from the Alaska Conference of Mayors and Alaska Municipal League  
C:\mva\exam\1994rv.doc

## ACoM and AML MUNICIPAL SURVEY

(Please take a few minutes to complete and return ASAP by FAX to 463-5480)

Municipality KENAI Completed by John P. Sweeney, Finance Director

1. Since 1985, have state cuts in Municipal Assistance/ Revenue Sharing and other municipal aid programs, transfers of state service responsibilities, unfunded mandates, and underfunding state programs (such as schools), been a major factor in local:

a. tax or fee increases? No  Yes, if yes, please give examples:

b. service cutbacks. No  Yes, if yes, please give examples:

- Property tax raised 0.8 mills, from 2.7 to 3.5 mills, in FY 1993.  
This made the total effective property tax 12.05 mills in FY 1993.
- Property tax raised 0.8 mills, from 1.9 to 2.7 mills, in FY 1987.
- Imposed 5% Hotel/Motel Room Tax in FY 1993.
- Imposed ambulance fees in FY 1996.

2. If the state continues the trends described in question 1, what do you feel the impacts on your community will be over the next several years: Kenai is reaching a point where projected revenues will no longer sustain the current level of municipal services, much less fund growth. Kenai may soon be faced with the prospects of either raising taxes or reducing service levels.

3. Since 1985, in addition to sales and property taxes, has your municipality had to implement other taxes or fees to maintain services? No  Yes, the most significant are:

- Imposed 5% Hotel/Motel Room Tax in FY 1993.
- Imposed ambulance fees in FY 1996.

4. Describe something your municipality accomplished that you are especially proud of, especially over the past year or so. For example, a new program to promote community economic growth, or a way to do more with less.

- Becoming an All American City in 1992.
- Constructing a congregate housing (unassisted living) complex for senior citizens. We feel our senior citizens program is the best in the state.

5. In a sentence, summarize the message you would like to give the state regarding municipal government. A major role of state government is to assist local government, either with direct capital funding or indirectly, through professional services/assistance. The State of Alaska must not forget this role!

**THANK YOU**, from the Alaska Conference of Mayors and Alaska Municipal League  
City of Kenai, Alaska

Since fiscal year 1986, total State of Alaska Municipal Assistance and Revenue Sharing provided to the City of Kenai has declined by 64.3% from a high of \$1,591,692 in FY86 to a projected low of \$567,708 in FY97, for a total decline of \$1,023,984.

### ACoM and AML MUNICIPAL SURVEY

(Please take a few minutes to complete and return ASAP by FAX to 463-5480)

Municipality Heidesburgh Completed by Jerry Lopez

- 1. Since 1985, have state cuts in Municipal Assistance/ Revenue Sharing and other municipal aid programs, transfers of state service responsibilities, unfunded mandates, and underfunding state programs (such as schools), been a major factor in local:
  - a. tax or fee increases?  No  Yes, if yes, please give examples:
  - b. service cutbacks.  No  Yes, if yes, please give examples:

Cut Backs To Fire Departments

- 2. If the state continues the trends described in question 1, what do you feel the impacts on your community will be over the next several years: IMPACTS  
Could lead to less fire service for our area. Also could lead to less area wide development

- 3. Since 1985, in addition to sales and property taxes, has your municipality had to implement other taxes or fees to maintain services?  No  Yes, the most significant are:

- 4. Describe something your municipality accomplished that you are especially proud of, especially over the past year or so. For example, a new program to promote community economic growth, or a way to do more with less.  
New Park For Tax Slips

- 5. In a sentence, summarize the message you would like to give the state regarding municipal government. The state has been putting more and more responsibilities on local government. They are taking away the resources to support these extra responsibilities.

THANK YOU, from the Alaska Conference of Mayors and Alaska Municipal League  
C:\arvic\mail\1907.mv.doc

### ACoM and AML MUNICIPAL SURVEY

(Please take a few minutes to complete and return ASAP by FAX to 463-5488)

Municipality DEVALI BOROUGH Completed by BOROUGH CLERK AND MAYOR GONZALES

1. Since 1985, have state cuts in Municipal Assistance/ Revenue Sharing and other municipal aid programs, transfers of state service responsibilities, unfunded mandates, and underfunding state programs (such as schools), been a major factor in local:

- a. tax or fee increases?  No  Yes, if yes, please give examples:
- b. service cutbacks.  No  Yes, if yes, please give examples:

SERVICES HAVE BEEN CUT IN THE FOLLOWING AREAS: DIS/FIRE DEPARTMENT  
LOCAL LIBRARIES, AND MENTAL HEALTH.

2. If the state continues the trends described in question 1, what do you feel the impacts on your community will be over the next several years: THESE SERVICES WILL  
CONTINUE TO DECREASE AND OTHER TAXES WILL HAVE TO BE IMPLEMENTED.  
THIS WILL FORCE OUR LOCAL GOVERNMENT TO TAX THE PEOPLE AND SUPPOSEDLY  
KEEP THE STATE OUT OF TAXATION.

3. Since 1985, in addition to sales and property taxes, has your municipality had to implement other taxes or fees to maintain services?  No  Yes, the most significant are: THE DEVALI BOROUGH HAS ONLY BEEN IN INCORPORATION FOR FIVE  
YEARS AND THIS DOES NOT APPLY NOW, BUT WILL IN THE FUTURE.

4. Describe something your municipality accomplished that you are especially proud of, especially over the past year or so. For example, a new program to promote community economic growth, or a way to do more with less.  
WE HAVE DONE EXTENSIVE RESEARCH FOR A NEW MUNICIPAL LAND DEVELOPMENT  
WILL CREATE A SAFE ATMOSPHERE, JOBS AND LOWER TIPPING FEES FOR  
OUR RESIDENTS.

5. In a sentence, summarize the message you would like to give the state regarding municipal government. WHILE THE STATE GOVERNMENT IS CLAIMING THAT  
THERE WILL BE NO TAXES IMPOSED IN ITS RESIDENTS, THEY ARE IN FACT  
TAKING THE PEOPLE THROUGH THEIR LOCAL GOVERNMENT BY REDUCING  
REVENUE SHARING AND MUNICIPAL ASSISTANCE!

**THANK YOU,** from the Alaska Conference of Mayors and Alaska Municipal League  
City/ Borough: Devali

## ACoM and AML MUNICIPAL SURVEY

(Please take a few minutes to complete and return ASAP by FAX to 463-5480)

Municipality Petersburg Completed by Jodell Jones

1. Since 1985, have state cuts in Municipal Assistance/ Revenue Sharing and other municipal aid programs, transfers of state service responsibilities, unfunded mandates, and underfunding state programs (such as schools), been a major factor in local:

a. tax or fee increases? No xx Yes, if yes, please give examples:

b. service cutbacks. No XX Yes, if yes, please give examples:

Sales tax rate increase from 5% to 6% in August of 1989; Police Dept. personnel cut., Library budget and fire Dept. budget. Cuts have severely restricted dollars available for capital improvement projects to city infrastructure. Dollars must go to operation and maintenance instead.

2. If the state continues the trends described in question 1, what do you feel the impacts on your community will be over the next several years: City of Petersburg has property tax cap of 10 mills; unless the voters agree to revoke the cap, an increase to sales tax or decrease of services is only recourse.

3. Since 1985, in addition to sales and property taxes, has your municipality had to implement other taxes or fees to maintain services? No X Yes, the most significant are: Parks & Rec fees increased to help support services. Building permit fees, ambulance fees, miscellaneous administrative fees and enterprise fund charges have all been increased.

4. Describe something your municipality accomplished that you are especially proud of, especially over the past year or so. For example, a new program to promote community economic growth, or a way to do more with less.

Co-opted with US Forest Service and non-profits to provide funding for several Parks & Rec projects

5. In a sentence, summarize the message you would like to give the state regarding municipal government. Unfunded state mandates should be eliminated: they impair the city's ability to cope with revenue sharing and municipal assistance cuts. Lack of funding for Sr. Citizen property tax exemption creates an undue burden.

**THANK YOU**, from the Alaska Conference of Mayors and Alaska Municipal League  
C:\msw\acm\1990\surv.doc

ACoM and AML MUNICIPAL SURVEY

Municipality Northwest Arctic Borough Completed By Chuck Greene, Mayor

1. Since 1986, have State cuts in Municipal Assistance/Revenue Sharing and other Municipal aid programs, transfers of state service responsibilities, unfunded mandates, and underfunding state programs been a major factor in local:

- a. Tax or Fee Increases?  No  Yes  
b. Service Cutbacks?  No  Yes

Road maintenance activities reduced more than 80%. (City Operations and maintenance reduced more than 98%. School Budget reduced 15% or more. Schools maintenance deferred. Replacement Schools delayed.

2. If the State continues the trends described in question 1, what do you feel will be the impacts on your community over the next several years:

Reduced ability of communities in jurisdiction to meet reporting requirements to handle own affairs-- Increased emphasis on Borough to provide these functions with resulting losses in maintenance of effort on economic development, zoning enforcement, pollution prevention, educational funding, etc. Sweeping changes in the school system organization at a pace so rapid as to threaten or injure the quality of education now available.

3. Since 1985, in addition to sales and property taxes, has your community had to implement other taxes and fees to maintain services  No  Yes. The most significant are:

A graduated scale of fees in lieu of taxes with the Cominco/Red Dog mine has kept this Borough afloat. Savings realized over the first few years of the agreement are now being depleted. There is no tax base for a reasonable alternative method of fund raising in this jurisdiction.

4. Describe something your community accomplished over the past year or two that you are especially proud of. For example, a new program to promote community economic growth, or a way to do more with less:

Village fires are deadly threats. The Kiava Volunteer Fire Department developed a system for dealing with them that was efficient and cost-effective. With Borough assistance, they can now market this system statewide. Each village developed the concept of putting together a "permanent fund" to assist with the cost of services, and new business starts who receive grant assistance through community eligibility must pledge 1% of gross profit to the community permanent fund. A new business start is happening in Buckland as an indirect result of Borough Planning which is an EXPORT INDUSTRY with renewable resources. Once again, 1% of the gross profit goes to a community permanent fund.

5. In a sentence, summarize the message you would like to give the state regarding municipal government:

Municipal government is an important segment of many local networks, including Search&Rescue, economic development, volunteer tax assistance, and maintaining the quality of life. To reduce the municipalities any further will destroy or severely cripple these networks.

### ACoM and AML MUNICIPAL SURVEY

(Please take a few minutes to complete and return ASAP by FAX to 463-5480)

Municipality Elim Completed by Mayor Darlene Kakra

1. Since 1985, have state cuts in Municipal Assistance/ Revenue Sharing and other municipal aid programs, transfers of state service responsibilities, unfunded mandates, and underfunding state programs (such as schools), been a major factor in local:

- a. tax or fee increases?  No  Yes, if yes, please give examples:
- b. service cutbacks.  No  Yes, if yes, please give examples:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

2. If the state continues the trends described in question 1, what do you feel the impacts on your community will be over the next several years:

1) removal of state inc tax  
2) less services to people, such as health  
3) increased dependence on state welfare programs because of rising unemployment.

3. Since 1985, in addition to sales and property taxes, has your municipality had to implement other taxes or fees to maintain services?  No  Yes, the most significant are:

sales taxes & water rates.  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

4. Describe something your municipality accomplished that you are especially proud of, especially over the past year or so. For example, a new program to promote community economic growth, or a way to do more with less.

A new water treatment plant was just put on line last month.  
\_\_\_\_\_

5. In a sentence, summarize the message you would like to give the state regarding municipal government.

The people of rural Alaska are not given their fair share of revenues that come from rural Alaska.

THANK YOU, from the Alaska Conference of Mayors and Alaska Municipal League  
C:\munic\munic\New.doc

### ACoM and AML MUNICIPAL SURVEY

(Please take a few minutes to complete and return ASAP by FAX to 463-5480)

Municipality Elim Completed by Luther Nagayuk

1. Since 1985, have state cuts in Municipal Assistance/ Revenue Sharing and other municipal aid programs, transfers of state service responsibilities, unfunded mandates, and underfunding state programs (such as schools), been a major factor in local:

- a. tax or fee increases?  No  Yes, if yes, please give examples:
- b. service cutbacks.  No  Yes, if yes, please give examples:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

2. If the state continues the trends described in question 1, what do you feel the impacts on your community will be over the next several years:

Services - (1) Maintenance - Road Repair  
(2) Increased Fees (3) Reduced Contributions  
(4) Economic Plans Reduction (5) Travel Conveyance  
Leaving City Post (6) Increased Welfare (7) Increased  
Unemployment (8)

3. Since 1985, in addition to sales and property taxes, has your municipality had to implement other taxes or fees to maintain services?  No  Yes, the most significant are:

Local Services - Increased Fees, Increased  
Water Fees, (Water Survey)

4. Describe something your municipality accomplished that you are especially proud of, especially over the past year or so. For example, a new program to promote community economic growth, or a way to do more with less.

THE MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT OF ELIM CONTINUES  
TO STRIKE UP FUNDS FOR SOCIAL PROJECTS TO  
KEEP OUR LOCAL PEOPLE WORKING.

5. In a sentence, summarize the message you would like to give the state regarding municipal government. "RURAL MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENTS WILL

CONTINUE TO LOSE UNLESS STATE & FEES ARE  
CHANGED" ALL RURAL NATURAL RESOURCES CONTINUE  
TO BUILD URBAN ALASKA.

THANK YOU, from the Alaska Conference of Mayors and Alaska Municipal League

C:\evln:\exam\1\Newrv.doc

### ACoM and AML MUNICIPAL SURVEY

(Please take a few minutes to complete and return ASAP by FAX to 463-6400)

Municipality KOTIKOUE Completed by ARTHUR KOTEN

1. Since 1985, have state cuts in Municipal Assistance/ Revenue Sharing and other municipal aid programs, transfers of state service responsibilities, unfunded mandates, and underfunding state programs (such as schools), been a major factor in local:

- a. tax or fee increases?  No  Yes, if yes, please give examples:
- b. service cutbacks.  No  Yes, if yes, please give examples:

SALES TAX INCREASED FROM 4% TO 6%  
NEW OR RE-CREATED CENTER JUST WITH AN INFLATION  
STAGE

2. If the state continues the trends described in question 1, what do you feel the impacts on your community will be over the next several years:

WILL BE FORCED TO AGAIN RAISE SALES TAXES TO MAINTAIN  
HEALTH AND SAFETY SERVICE LEVELS

3. Since 1985, in addition to sales and property taxes, has your municipality had to implement other taxes or fees to maintain services?  No  Yes, the most significant are:

SALES TAX TO MAINTAIN PUBLIC UTILITIES OPERATIONS  
BEHOLD AN OTHER TAXES

4. Describe something your municipality accomplished that you are especially proud of, especially over the past year or so. For example, a new program to promote community economic growth, or a way to do more with less.

NA

5. In a sentence, summarize the message you would like to give the state regarding municipal government.

ALASKA IS A LARGE STATE WITH A  
SPACE PROBLEM - THE STATE GOVERNMENT MUST TAKE RESPONSIBILITY FOR  
ECONOMIC DISTRESS - MAINTAIN SERVICES WITHOUT INCREASING TAXES  
AND REVENUE SHARING

THANK YOU, from the Alaska Conference of Mayors and Alaska Municipal League

## ACoM and AML MUNICIPAL SURVEY

(Please take a few minutes to complete and return ASAP by FAX to 463-5480)

Municipality City of Thorne Completed by Ray McMaster, Mayor  
Bay

- Since 1985, have state cuts in Municipal Assistance/ Revenue Sharing and other municipal aid programs, transfers of state service responsibilities, unfunded mandates, and underfunding state programs (such as schools), been a major factor in local:
  - tax or fee increases?  No  Yes, if yes, please give examples:
  - service cutbacks.  No  Yes, if yes, please give examples:

Utility, clinic, and harbor user fee increases; sales tax increase to make up for reduced funding for clinic and emergency services operations.

Reductions in parks and recreation maintenance and operations; reduced road maintenance. Reduced clinic hours of operation, reduced funding for emergency services.
- If the state continues the trends described in question 1, what do you feel the impacts on your community will be over the next several years:  
Continued increases in fees and taxes and/or further reductions in essential services (fire, emergency medical, law enforcement, pollution control, etc.)
- Since 1985, in addition to sales and property taxes, has your municipality had to implement other taxes or fees to maintain services?  No  Yes, the most significant are: increased utility rates for water, sewer, refuse, and electric services; initiating animal licensing fees and increased fines; initiating fees for administrative services, ie copying, faxing, notarizing, etc.
- Describe something your municipality accomplished that you are especially proud of, especially over the past year or so. For example, a new program to promote community economic growth, or a way to do more with less.  
Constructed with state and federal assistance, the first regional solid waste treatment and disposal facility on Prince of Wales Island, Alaska, so that survey, appraisal, and sale of 11 additional industrial lots to the general public may proceed; constructed the first park the community has ever had.
- In a sentence, summarize the message you would like to give the state regarding municipal government. Reductions in municipal assistance, revenue sharing and PCE programs do not reduce government's costs for services for costs. It reduce the public costs for those services - it merely places that cost and more of the burden to local government. In some cases, these cuts result in local government inability to provide essential services at all especially in small, rural communities where revenue generating ability is limited and program funds helped support high per capita costs associated with maintenance and operation of water, sewer, and refuse services. Communities can no longer pay for operation and maintenance of these facilities they fail. System fail cost many more dollars than any savings the legislature perceives to occur through reduction in these program fundings to communities.