

776

SCRA

HB 192

00072

149	WUTHERIC	427, 366	0.142	429, 576	0.032	428, 947	0.092	428, 954	0.092
150	LARSEN BAY	422, 623	0.122	424, 455	0.082	423, 387	0.072	423, 393	0.072
151	LORR KALSKAG	438, 395	0.472	438, 879	0.292	434, 123	0.312	434, 138	0.312
152	MAHERBOKAK	426, 576	0.142	428, 720	0.092	428, 112	0.092	428, 119	0.092
153	MCGRAH	432, 103	0.172	432, 755	0.102	432, 755	0.112	433, 121	0.112
154	MEKRYAK	427, 366	0.142	429, 576	0.092	428, 947	0.092	428, 954	0.092
155	MERRAHI VILLAGE	446, 103	0.242	446, 444	0.152	451, 581	0.172	451, 589	0.172
156	MAYAKAK	423, 576	0.132	430, 295	0.102	429, 079	0.092	429, 385	0.092
157	MAYAKAK	427, 366	0.142	429, 576	0.092	429, 075	0.092	429, 082	0.092
158	MORALEN	426, 576	0.142	428, 723	0.092	427, 466	0.092	427, 471	0.092
159	MUO STAVAKK	426, 576	0.142	428, 723	0.092	428, 112	0.092	428, 119	0.092
160	NEWOK	427, 366	0.142	429, 576	0.092	428, 947	0.092	428, 954	0.092
161	NIGORDE	427, 366	0.142	429, 576	0.092	428, 947	0.092	428, 954	0.092
162	NIKAI	428, 155	0.152	430, 427	0.102	429, 097	0.092	429, 105	0.092
163	PERAL NPI	426, 576	0.142	428, 720	0.092	427, 466	0.092	427, 473	0.092
164	PEROK	429, 272	0.152	431, 086	0.102	430, 039	0.102	430, 046	0.102
165	PELAI	430, 236	0.162	431, 653	0.102	431, 537	0.102	431, 543	0.102
166	PHIGSU	428, 155	0.152	430, 427	0.102	429, 097	0.092	429, 105	0.092
167	CHU HARBUR	424, 445	0.142	425, 525	0.082	424, 917	0.082	424, 922	0.082
168	CHUIKIE	422, 915	0.132	424, 623	0.082	423, 627	0.072	423, 633	0.072
169	PILOT STATION	428, 352	0.152	430, 154	0.102	429, 113	0.092	429, 120	0.092
170	PLATHIM	441, 666	0.222	441, 894	0.132	441, 849	0.132	441, 855	0.132
171	POINT NEPE	428, 155	0.152	430, 427	0.102	429, 097	0.092	429, 105	0.092
172	PURT ALXANDER	421, 840	0.112	423, 604	0.072	422, 571	0.072	422, 577	0.072
173	PURT NEHEN	423, 430	0.442	433, 895	0.272	438, 846	0.292	438, 859	0.292
174	PURT LORPS	423, 625	0.122	425, 042	0.082	424, 226	0.082	424, 231	0.082
175	WITWAKAR	427, 366	0.142	429, 576	0.092	429, 467	0.092	429, 474	0.092
176	REBY	428, 155	0.152	430, 427	0.102	429, 097	0.092	429, 105	0.092
177	RUSHAN MUSHON	427, 366	0.142	429, 576	0.092	428, 282	0.092	428, 289	0.092
178	SAINI MICHAEL	427, 366	0.142	429, 576	0.092	428, 947	0.092	428, 954	0.092
179	SAINI PAUL	417, 630	0.622	418, 281	0.392	418, 146	0.392	418, 164	0.392
180	SAYARSA	427, 366	0.142	429, 576	0.092	428, 947	0.092	428, 954	0.092
181	SAYARI	422, 151	0.112	423, 398	0.072	422, 683	0.072	422, 688	0.072
182	SEAFERRI BAY	427, 382	0.142	429, 936	0.092	429, 467	0.092	429, 474	0.092
183	SELAMIR	428, 155	0.152	430, 427	0.102	429, 105	0.092	429, 112	0.092
184	SELAGLIK	428, 155	0.152	430, 427	0.102	429, 097	0.092	429, 105	0.092
185	SHACHLIK	446, 103	0.242	446, 444	0.152	451, 581	0.172	451, 589	0.172
186	SHELDERS POINT	427, 366	0.142	429, 576	0.092	428, 282	0.092	428, 289	0.092
187	SHELDERS POINT	428, 342	0.152	430, 148	0.102	429, 771	0.092	429, 777	0.092
188	SHELDERS POINT	428, 155	0.152	430, 427	0.102	429, 782	0.092	429, 789	0.092
189	SHELDERS POINT	427, 366	0.142	429, 576	0.092	428, 947	0.092	428, 954	0.092
190	TANANA	436, 720	0.192	436, 921	0.122	436, 881	0.122	436, 887	0.122
191	WILLER	428, 693	0.152	430, 356	0.102	430, 066	0.102	430, 072	0.102
192	TERANGE SPRINGS	422, 213	0.112	423, 835	0.072	422, 303	0.072	422, 308	0.072
193	TEGLAK	423, 572	0.152	430, 130	0.102	429, 485	0.092	429, 491	0.092
194	TEGLAK BAY	427, 366	0.142	429, 576	0.092	428, 947	0.092	428, 954	0.092
195	THEBOKAK	444, 573	0.232	444, 817	0.142	449, 059	0.162	449, 067	0.162
196	THEBOKAK	427, 366	0.142	429, 576	0.092	428, 947	0.092	428, 954	0.092
197	THEBOKAK BAY	431, 914	0.172	432, 252	0.102	435, 101	0.112	435, 107	0.112
198	THEBOKAK BAY	428, 155	0.152	430, 427	0.102	429, 097	0.092	429, 105	0.092
199	THEBOKAK BAY	428, 155	0.152	430, 427	0.102	429, 097	0.092	429, 105	0.092
200	MALES	426, 576	0.142	428, 720	0.092	427, 466	0.092	427, 473	0.092
201	WASHILA	413, 731	0.602	414, 353	0.382	414, 240	0.382	414, 247	0.382
202	WITHE SHEPHERD	426, 576	0.142	428, 720	0.092	427, 466	0.092	427, 473	0.092
203	WITHE SHEPHERD	430, 001	0.162	430, 165	0.102	434, 724	0.112	434, 730	0.112
204	WITHE SHEPHERD	428, 155	0.152	430, 427	0.102	429, 782	0.092	429, 789	0.092
205	EXT LINE ARRAYS	421, 050	0.112	422, 749	0.072	429, 350	0.232	429, 351	0.232

430, 000, 000

430, 000, 000

430, 000, 000

430, 000, 000

418, 740, 881

Supplied by
T. Gardiner

HOUSE RESEARCH AGENCY
Pouch Y - State Capitol
Juneau, Alaska 99811
465-3991

MEMORANDUM

March 27, 1980

TO: Representative Terry Gardiner

FROM: Jack Kreinheder *JK*
Issues Analyst

RE: HB 192 Computer Runs at Total Entitlements of \$24, \$26 and \$28 Million (Research Request No. 64)

The attached chart provides percentage breakdowns by local government of revenue sharing entitlements at various total entitlement levels, and is organized as follows:

- 1) FY 1979 revenue sharing entitlements (actual total entitlement = \$13.8 million)
- 2) FY 1980 entitlements (actual total entitlement = \$12 million)
- 3) HB 192 entitlements (proposed total entitlement = \$24 million)
- 4) HB 192 entitlements (proposed total entitlement = \$26 million)
- 5) HB 192 entitlements (proposed total entitlement = \$28 million)

All five of these revenue sharing computer runs exclude hospital construction, hospital and health facility operational entitlements, and per capita health power entitlements. The three HB 192 computer runs include Municipal Utilities Service Assessment in-lieu of tax revenues for the municipalities which collect them: Anchorage, Fairbanks, Ketchikan and Seward.

The decrease in the revenue sharing entitlement, excluding hospital and health funding, of about \$1.8 million from FY 1979 to FY 1980 reflects the fact that although the total entitlement increased by about \$1.5 million in 1980, hospital and health entitlements increased from \$4.7 million to over \$8 million, thus reducing the remaining entitlements. As you know, most of this increase in hospital and health entitlements is attributable to hospital construction funding, which increased from 13 percent of the total revenue sharing entitlement in FY 1979 to 28 percent in 1980.

Please let us know if we may be of further assistance.

JK/dp

Note: All entitlements exclude
Hospital & Health entitle-
ments and include MUSA revenues.

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF REVENUE SHARING ENTITLEMENTS

LOCAL GOV'T	FY 1979		FY 1980		HB 192 ENTITLEMENT (TOTAL=\$24,000,000)		HB 192 ENTITLEMENT (TOTAL=\$26,000,000)		HB 192 ENTITLEMENT (TOTAL=\$28,000,000)	
	ENTITLEMENT	PERCENTAGE	ENTITLEMENT	PERCENTAGE	ENTITLEMENT	PERCENTAGE	ENTITLEMENT	PERCENTAGE	ENTITLEMENT	PERCENTAGE
BOROUGH AND SERVICE AREAS										
1 ANCHORAGE A.W.	\$2,062,433	10.76%	\$1,880,015	11.05%	\$4,331,149	18.29%	\$4,004,953	18.36%	\$5,419,871	19.35%
2 CITY S.A.	\$272,755	1.46%	\$239,446	1.99%	\$294,225	1.22%	\$328,653	1.26%	\$331,155	1.22%
3 EAGLE RIVER	\$52,991	0.28%	\$42,403	0.35%	\$31,364	0.13%	\$35,034	0.13%	\$38,712	0.14%
4 CHEGLAK	\$43,358	0.23%	\$27,316	0.23%	\$6,562	0.03%	\$7,442	0.03%	\$8,223	0.03%
5 GIRDWOOD	\$6,779	0.03%	\$4,575	0.02%	\$1,374	0.00%	\$1,473	0.00%	\$1,636	0.00%
6 GLEN ALPS	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$100	0.00%	\$111	0.00%
7 FIRE S.A.	\$1,311,988	6.08%	\$958,325	7.99%	\$752,125	3.14%	\$840,139	3.23%	\$920,126	3.31%
8 ROADS & DRAINAGE	\$520,321	2.79%	\$438,495	3.65%	\$1,602,732	6.67%	\$1,577,121	6.05%	\$1,751,617	6.25%
9 POLICE S.A.	\$1,561,039	8.33%	\$1,533,736	13.33%	\$1,055,830	4.44%	\$1,190,542	4.57%	\$1,315,524	4.69%
10 PARKS & REC.	\$754,653	4.05%	\$657,089	5.47%	\$301,533	1.25%	\$336,315	1.29%	\$372,173	1.32%
11 P & R/CHEGLAK	\$64,562	0.34%	\$46,802	0.39%	\$19,060	0.08%	\$21,290	0.08%	\$23,525	0.08%
12 SOLID WASTE S.A.	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$72,803	0.30%	\$81,361	0.31%	\$89,332	0.32%
13 CHEGLAK/SOLID WASTE	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$2,377	0.00%	\$2,655	0.01%	\$2,934	0.01%
14 BUILDING SAFETY	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$111,000	0.46%	\$123,033	0.47%	\$137,005	0.48%
15 SPECIAL AGREEMENT	\$0	0.00%	\$21,157	0.17%	\$150,379	0.62%	\$162,452	0.62%	\$174,533	0.62%
	\$6,410,733	34.47%	\$5,752,264	44.60%	\$8,892,545	36.67%	\$9,714,024	37.36%	\$10,627,317	37.95%
16 BRISTOL BAY BOROUGH	\$27,515	0.14%	\$43,670	0.40%	\$126,734	0.52%	\$139,995	0.53%	\$153,274	0.54%
17 SOUTH HAVEN S.A.	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%
	\$27,515	0.14%	\$43,670	0.40%	\$126,734	0.52%	\$140,000	0.54%	\$154,233	0.55%
18 FAIRBANKS BOROUGH	\$256,404	5.14%	\$816,425	6.30%	\$1,603,533	6.70%	\$1,731,026	6.65%	\$1,950,380	6.97%
19 BALLAINE LAKE	\$466	0.00%	\$401	0.00%	\$1,334	0.00%	\$1,334	0.00%	\$1,439	0.00%
20 DIAMOND	\$2,461	0.01%	\$2,074	0.01%	\$4,314	0.02%	\$4,362	0.02%	\$4,630	0.02%
21 MIDWINTER ACRES	\$4,303	0.02%	\$11,043	0.09%	\$24,513	0.10%	\$24,513	0.09%	\$24,513	0.08%
22 SOUTH BAY	\$4,032	0.02%	\$1,459	0.01%	\$11,724	0.05%	\$12,305	0.05%	\$12,631	0.04%
23 LIGHTER BULK	\$4,335	0.02%	\$0	0.00%	\$333	0.00%	\$333	0.00%	\$333	0.00%
24 FISH LAKE	\$3,135	0.01%	\$1,344	0.01%	\$5,940	0.02%	\$5,951	0.02%	\$5,951	0.02%
25 NORTH STAR T.P.	\$50,007	0.26%	\$67,141	0.51%	\$30,301	0.01%	\$32,673	0.01%	\$35,000	0.01%
26 BECKER RIDGE	\$10,100	0.05%	\$1,519	0.01%	\$19,114	0.08%	\$19,114	0.07%	\$19,562	0.07%
27 BRIMLEY T.P.	\$55,216	0.28%	\$46,513	0.36%	\$48,564	0.20%	\$44,247	0.17%	\$40,261	0.14%
28 LAUREY HILL	\$4,232	0.02%	\$1,117	0.01%	\$10,032	0.04%	\$10,123	0.04%	\$10,574	0.04%
29 SERVICE AREAS	\$39	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$1,924	0.00%	\$1,939	0.00%	\$1,953	0.00%
	\$11,039,911	5.89%	\$9,477,714	7.31%	\$11,757,873	7.32%	\$11,939,420	7.45%	\$12,121,367	7.57%
30 HATHLET BOROUGH	\$2,611	0.01%	\$2,200	0.01%	\$25,373	0.10%	\$28,936	0.11%	\$31,950	0.11%
31 JOURNAL BOROUGH A.W.	\$14,169	1.03%	\$252,062	2.01%	\$1,113,638	4.63%	\$1,149,531	4.42%	\$1,190,703	4.25%
32 S.A. 1	\$133,011	0.79%	\$124,100	1.01%	\$226,573	1.00%	\$239,400	1.00%	\$253,336	1.10%
33 S.A. 2	\$15,213	0.11%	\$29,811	0.24%	\$27,600	0.11%	\$29,432	0.11%	\$31,246	0.11%
34 S.A. 3	\$41,121	0.21%	\$40,266	0.31%	\$37,439	0.16%	\$38,517	0.15%	\$39,533	0.14%
35 S.A. 4	\$9,187	0.05%	\$4,970	0.04%	\$6,317	0.03%	\$7,056	0.03%	\$7,797	0.03%
36 S.A. 5	\$64,130	0.32%	\$59,141	0.46%	\$45,936	0.19%	\$47,299	0.18%	\$48,636	0.17%
37 S.A. 6	\$4,931	0.02%	\$4,113	0.03%	\$2,332	0.00%	\$2,642	0.01%	\$2,952	0.01%
38 S.A. 7	\$1,969	0.01%	\$1,537	0.01%	\$730	0.00%	\$815	0.00%	\$891	0.00%
39 S.A. 8	\$1,562	0.01%	\$1,230	0.01%	\$401	0.00%	\$439	0.00%	\$469	0.00%
	\$1,036,041	5.37%	\$944,900	7.37%	\$1,556,171	6.48%	\$1,522,542	5.82%	\$1,599,024	5.71%

40 KENAI PENINSULA BOROUGH	\$96,967	0.52%	\$41,224	0.34%	\$329,738	1.37%	\$368,321	1.41%	\$406,987	1.45%
41 CENTRAL HOSPITAL	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$9,595	0.03%	\$10,715	0.04%	\$11,844	0.04%
42 SOUTH HOSPITAL	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$17,354	0.07%	\$19,385	0.07%	\$21,420	0.07%
43 NIKISKI F.P.	\$25,092	0.13%	\$21,273	0.17%	\$10,375	0.04%	\$11,500	0.04%	\$12,505	0.04%
44 NORTH KENAI REC.	\$18,219	0.09%	\$15,442	0.12%	\$7,271	0.03%	\$8,122	0.03%	\$8,975	0.03%
45 BEAR CREEK F.P.	\$4,940	0.02%	\$4,000	0.03%	\$7,516	0.03%	\$8,335	0.03%	\$9,277	0.03%
	\$145,219	0.78%	\$81,940	0.68%	\$381,853	1.59%	\$426,533	1.64%	\$471,311	1.82%
46 KETCHIKAN BOROUGH	\$81,615	0.43%	\$70,843	0.59%	\$205,338	1.21%	\$231,079	1.27%	\$265,836	1.30%
47 SHORCLINE S.A.	\$4,569	0.02%	\$3,953	0.03%	\$2,332	0.00%	\$2,672	0.01%	\$2,952	0.01%
	\$86,185	0.46%	\$74,806	0.62%	\$208,790	1.26%	\$233,751	1.28%	\$268,788	1.31%
48 KODIAK ISLAND BOROUGH	\$44,621	0.23%	\$23,747	0.19%	\$117,615	0.49%	\$131,377	0.50%	\$145,169	0.51%
49 FIRE DISTRICT 1	\$13,326	0.07%	\$10,661	0.08%	\$6,163	0.02%	\$6,885	0.02%	\$7,607	0.02%
50 ROAD DISTRICT	\$21,575	0.11%	\$18,182	0.15%	\$43,619	0.18%	\$44,032	0.16%	\$46,443	0.15%
	\$79,522	0.41%	\$52,590	0.43%	\$167,397	0.69%	\$182,294	0.70%	\$197,220	0.70%
51 MAT-SU BOROUGH	\$119,309	0.64%	\$65,104	2.87%	\$819,327	3.41%	\$862,272	3.31%	\$905,311	3.23%
52 WASILLA F.P.	\$25,119	0.13%	\$22,639	0.18%	\$4,863	0.02%	\$5,437	0.02%	\$6,008	0.02%
53 BUTTE F.P.	\$14,723	0.07%	\$14,658	0.12%	\$3,017	0.01%	\$3,370	0.01%	\$3,724	0.01%
54 GREATER PALMER F.P.	\$21,009	0.11%	\$20,911	0.17%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%
55 SUTTON F.P.	\$4,810	0.02%	\$4,784	0.03%	\$2,379	0.00%	\$2,657	0.01%	\$2,936	0.01%
56 NON ARCA-WIDE	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$12,603	0.05%	\$14,084	0.05%	\$15,562	0.05%
57 TALKEETNA FLOOD S.A.	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$1,359	0.00%	\$1,513	0.00%	\$1,677	0.00%
58 GARDEN TERRACE	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$767	0.00%	\$856	0.00%	\$946	0.00%
	\$189,977	0.99%	\$408,169	3.40%	\$844,327	3.51%	\$890,197	3.42%	\$936,133	3.34%
59 NORTH SLOPE BOROUGH	\$233,976	1.25%	\$203,503	1.69%	\$237,795	0.99%	\$256,993	0.98%	\$276,227	0.98%
60 SITKA BOROUGH	\$293,311	1.53%	\$236,649	1.95%	\$266,562	1.11%	\$292,908	1.12%	\$319,303	1.14%
FIRST CLASS CITIES										
61 BARROW	\$40,409	0.21%	\$34,122	0.28%	\$62,316	0.25%	\$69,608	0.26%	\$76,915	0.27%
62 CORDOVA	\$119,233	0.60%	\$91,371	0.76%	\$179,663	0.74%	\$197,914	0.76%	\$216,197	0.77%
63 CRAIG	\$23,254	0.12%	\$19,856	0.16%	\$48,760	0.20%	\$53,156	0.20%	\$57,561	0.20%
64 DILLINGHAM	\$57,726	0.31%	\$46,407	0.38%	\$97,176	0.4%	\$106,875	0.4%	\$116,589	0.36%
65 FAIRBANKS	\$302,338	4.85%	\$709,341	5.91%	\$1,752,195	7.30%	\$1,928,132	7.41%	\$2,104,516	7.51%
66 GALENA	\$37,115	0.19%	\$31,914	0.26%	\$63,859	0.24%	\$69,865	0.24%	\$75,873	0.24%
67 HAINES	\$58,806	0.31%	\$49,034	0.41%	\$89,211	0.37%	\$96,892	0.37%	\$104,580	0.36%
68 HEER	\$74,485	0.40%	\$69,574	0.57%	\$87,031	0.36%	\$94,639	0.36%	\$102,241	0.35%
69 HUMBOLDT	\$33,703	0.20%	\$28,671	0.24%	\$40,905	0.17%	\$44,440	0.17%	\$47,982	0.17%
70 HUZARURG	\$9,767	0.05%	\$8,762	0.08%	\$12,938	0.09%	\$14,440	0.09%	\$15,942	0.08%
71 KAIL	\$13,053	0.07%	\$11,927	0.1%	\$27,267	0.11%	\$29,169	0.11%	\$31,071	0.11%
72 KENAI	\$224,863	1.20%	\$166,757	1.38%	\$372,672	1.55%	\$402,283	1.54%	\$431,891	1.54%
73 KETCHIKAN	\$255,237	1.37%	\$208,143	1.74%	\$459,571	2.37%	\$491,335	2.42%	\$523,103	2.47%
74 KING COVE	\$20,070	0.10%	\$17,913	0.14%	\$37,319	0.11%	\$40,213	0.10%	\$43,107	0.10%
75 KLAMACK	\$10,472	0.05%	\$10,560	0.08%	\$23,574	0.09%	\$25,399	0.09%	\$27,224	0.09%
76 KODIAK	\$194,916	1.04%	\$156,251	1.36%	\$315,380	0.19%	\$345,549	0.19%	\$375,718	0.19%
77 NENANA	\$45,923	0.24%	\$38,539	0.32%	\$63,279	0.26%	\$68,900	0.26%	\$74,521	0.27%
78 NEEB	\$112,035	0.60%	\$111,761	0.93%	\$237,095	0.98%	\$256,832	1.00%	\$276,569	1.01%
79 NORTH POLE	\$26,662	0.14%	\$23,197	0.19%	\$42,131	0.21%	\$45,644	0.21%	\$49,157	0.20%
80 PALMER	\$91,142	0.49%	\$85,141	0.74%	\$142,332	0.59%	\$151,339	0.58%	\$160,346	0.58%
81 PELICAN	\$5,291	0.03%	\$4,316	0.04%	\$8,085	0.03%	\$8,613	0.03%	\$9,141	0.03%
82 PEPPERBUSH	\$117,595	0.61%	\$94,233	0.78%	\$185,459	0.75%	\$200,721	0.76%	\$216,004	0.76%
83 SAND POINT	\$16,987	0.09%	\$14,151	0.12%	\$28,403	0.20%	\$30,134	0.19%	\$31,865	0.19%
84 SAINT MARYS	\$16,115	0.08%	\$13,119	0.11%	\$25,255	0.20%	\$27,154	0.19%	\$29,053	0.18%
85 SILVERTIA	\$35,632	0.19%	\$30,361	0.25%	\$53,764	0.22%	\$58,071	0.22%	\$62,378	0.22%
86 STEWARD	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$124,099	0.51%	\$134,331	0.51%	\$144,563	0.50%
87 SUGSMAY	\$49,154	0.26%	\$41,949	0.35%	\$83,315	0.34%	\$89,931	0.34%	\$96,547	0.34%
88 TONGUE POINT	\$193,051	1.01%	\$164,552	1.37%	\$304,057	1.24%	\$328,736	1.24%	\$353,415	1.24%
89 ULM S.A.	\$85,411	0.45%	\$72,151	0.60%	\$141,716	0.58%	\$153,119	0.58%	\$164,522	0.58%

90 VALDEZ	\$186,963	1.00%	\$137,150	1.14%	\$136,901	0.57%	\$136,959	0.52%	\$137,008	0.48%
91 ZONE I	40	0.00%	40	0.00%	40	0.00%	40	0.00%	40	0.00%
92 ZONE II	40	0.00%	40	0.00%	40	0.00%	40	0.00%	40	0.00%
	\$186,963	1.00%	\$137,150	1.14%	\$136,901	0.57%	\$136,959	0.52%	\$137,008	0.48%
93 BRANDELL	\$119,011	0.64%	105,108	0.79%	1211,112	0.87%	1233,689	0.89%	1256,314	0.91%
94 ZONE III	40	0.00%	40	0.00%	423,243	0.09%	423,962	0.09%	423,688	0.10%
95 ZONE IV	40	0.00%	40	0.00%	183,494	0.34%	493,264	0.35%	1103,055	0.36%
	\$119,011	0.64%	105,108	0.79%	1317,850	1.32%	1352,916	1.35%	1383,058	1.38%
97 YACHT	\$13,873	0.07%	11,691	0.09%	124,766	0.10%	124,954	0.09%	125,114	0.08%
SECOND CLASS CITIES										
98 AGRIUM	\$1,414	0.00%	16,071	0.05%	124,978	0.10%	125,149	0.09%	125,293	0.09%
99 AKTACHAK	127,567	0.14%	119,322	0.16%	131,472	0.13%	131,569	0.12%	131,651	0.11%
100 AKTAR	13,784	0.02%	13,523	0.02%	128,717	0.11%	129,051	0.11%	129,334	0.10%
101 AKOENLIT	198,606	0.53%	157,837	0.48%	137,104	0.36%	137,140	0.33%	137,171	0.31%
102 ALAKANIK	127,511	0.14%	123,029	0.19%	131,100	0.12%	131,229	0.12%	131,338	0.11%
103 ALKASAYIK	40	0.00%	15,273	0.04%	127,889	0.11%	128,213	0.10%	128,488	0.10%
104 ALAKAKET	\$5,053	0.04%	16,736	0.05%	130,580	0.12%	130,835	0.11%	131,050	0.11%
105 ANBLER	117,221	0.09%	113,654	0.11%	131,545	0.13%	131,717	0.12%	131,862	0.11%
106 ANAKUMUK PASS	40	0.00%	40	0.00%	129,545	0.12%	129,839	0.11%	130,180	0.10%
107 ANDERSON	116,297	0.08%	113,734	0.11%	131,401	0.13%	131,640	0.12%	131,791	0.11%
108 ANGOUH	123,529	0.12%	120,195	0.16%	124,458	0.10%	124,532	0.09%	124,705	0.08%
109 ANIAR	117,714	0.09%	125,938	0.21%	138,049	0.15%	138,065	0.14%	138,079	0.13%
110 ANIAR	40	0.00%	40	0.00%	129,545	0.12%	129,889	0.11%	130,180	0.10%
111 ANNAHOLAK	120,938	0.11%	117,981	0.14%	132,068	0.13%	132,114	0.12%	132,153	0.11%
112 ANIHL	119,844	1.04%	118,321	1.57%	126,651	1.10%	126,980	1.08%	127,336	1.06%
113 ANVIG NISSUM	40	0.00%	12,801	0.02%	128,717	0.11%	129,051	0.11%	129,334	0.10%
114 ANIHL	13,569	0.01%	12,905	0.02%	129,545	0.12%	129,889	0.11%	130,180	0.10%
115 ANIHL	11,774	0.00%	11,925	0.03%	128,717	0.11%	129,051	0.11%	129,334	0.10%
116 ANIHL	19,087	0.04%	112,852	0.10%	128,993	0.12%	129,221	0.11%	129,491	0.10%
117 ANIHL	13,762	0.02%	110,321	0.08%	131,308	0.13%	131,500	0.12%	131,662	0.11%
118 ANIHL	40	0.00%	40	0.00%	127,289	0.11%	127,213	0.10%	127,488	0.10%
119 ANIHL	126,485	0.14%	122,300	0.18%	128,233	0.11%	128,285	0.10%	128,329	0.10%
120 ANIHL	11,056	0.00%	11,000	0.00%	127,889	0.11%	128,213	0.10%	128,488	0.10%
121 ANIHL	14,267	0.02%	13,674	0.03%	126,181	0.10%	126,410	0.10%	126,603	0.09%
122 ANIHL	18,782	0.04%	17,350	0.06%	128,717	0.11%	129,051	0.11%	129,334	0.10%
123 ANIHL	40	0.00%	40	0.00%	127,889	0.11%	128,213	0.10%	128,488	0.10%
124 ANIHL	40	0.00%	14,580	0.03%	128,717	0.11%	129,051	0.11%	129,334	0.10%
125 ANIHL	119,988	0.10%	116,449	0.13%	129,987	0.12%	130,212	0.11%	130,402	0.10%
126 ANIHL	147,683	0.25%	140,167	0.31%	151,133	0.21%	151,155	0.19%	151,173	0.18%
127 ANIHL	14,748	0.02%	113,260	0.11%	130,486	0.12%	130,638	0.11%	130,802	0.11%
128 ANIHL	124,158	0.12%	118,779	0.15%	131,323	0.13%	131,473	0.12%	131,576	0.11%
129 ANIHL	13,255	0.01%	12,825	0.02%	128,717	0.11%	129,051	0.11%	129,334	0.10%
130 ANIHL	17,487	0.04%	17,400	0.00%	128,717	0.11%	129,051	0.11%	129,334	0.10%
131 ANIHL	14,311	0.00%	17,465	0.06%	130,771	0.12%	131,010	0.11%	131,211	0.11%
132 ANIHL	112,852	0.03%	110,435	0.08%	131,078	0.12%	131,299	0.12%	131,469	0.11%
133 ANIHL	116,591	0.09%	110,133	0.09%	128,717	0.11%	129,051	0.11%	129,334	0.10%
134 ANIHL	139,183	0.21%	136,179	0.28%	166,150	0.27%	166,177	0.25%	166,201	0.23%
135 ANIHL	11,461	0.00%	11,211	0.01%	129,545	0.12%	129,889	0.11%	130,180	0.10%
136 ANIHL	131,600	0.18%	129,800	0.24%	159,310	0.24%	159,135	0.22%	159,156	0.21%
137 ANIHL	40	0.00%	40	0.00%	128,747	0.09%	129,023	0.09%	129,257	0.08%
138 ANIHL	12,163	0.01%	12,411	0.02%	129,545	0.12%	129,889	0.11%	130,180	0.10%
139 ANIHL	113,025	0.04%	116,703	0.05%	130,312	0.12%	130,539	0.11%	130,825	0.11%
140 ANIHL	1512	0.00%	1432	0.00%	122,090	0.09%	122,347	0.08%	122,564	0.08%
141 ANIHL	113,080	0.08%	113,720	0.11%	130,702	0.12%	130,947	0.11%	131,153	0.11%
142 ANIHL	16,635	0.01%	16,503	0.05%	129,545	0.12%	129,889	0.11%	130,180	0.10%
143 ANIHL	40	0.00%	17,545	0.06%	131,078	0.12%	131,299	0.12%	131,469	0.11%
144 ANIHL	16,012	0.01%	15,066	0.04%	128,717	0.11%	129,051	0.11%	129,334	0.10%
145 ANIHL	1126,467	0.83%	1111,853	0.93%	1162,487	0.59%	1162,021	0.59%	1162,136	0.57%
146 ANIHL	14,614	0.01%	14,126	0.04%	128,937	0.12%	129,252	0.11%	129,519	0.10%
147 ANIHL	11,169	0.00%	10,95	0.00%	129,545	0.12%	129,889	0.11%	130,180	0.10%

149 KREIBER	\$12,614	0.062	\$10,630	0.082	\$28,717	0.112	\$29,051	0.112	\$29,334	0.102
150 LAISER BAY	40	0.002	41,343	0.012	\$23,747	0.092	\$24,023	0.092	\$24,257	0.082
151 LEPPER KALISAG	40	0.002	44,218	0.382	\$88,782	0.362	\$88,819	0.342	\$88,851	0.312
152 MARIOTAK	40	0.032	45,101	0.042	\$27,889	0.112	\$28,213	0.102	\$28,483	0.102
153 MEGORAK	40	0.102	47,926	0.182	\$32,530	0.132	\$32,617	0.122	\$32,630	0.112
154 MEGORAK	40	0.032	45,715	0.032	\$28,717	0.112	\$29,051	0.112	\$29,334	0.102
155 MEGORAK VILLAGE	40	0.102	\$35,024	0.232	446,300	0.192	446,410	0.172	446,426	0.162
156 NAPAOTAK	\$13,038	0.072	\$11,129	0.092	\$29,640	0.122	\$29,895	0.112	\$29,934	0.102
157 NAPAOTAK	45,360	0.022	45,042	0.042	\$28,717	0.112	\$29,051	0.112	\$29,334	0.102
158 NAPAOTAK	40	0.032	40	0.002	\$27,889	0.112	\$28,213	0.102	\$28,483	0.102
159 NEW SHWANERK	46,354	0.032	45,355	0.042	\$27,889	0.112	\$28,213	0.102	\$28,483	0.102
160 NEWERK	44,375	0.022	43,687	0.032	\$28,717	0.112	\$29,051	0.112	\$29,334	0.102
161 NIGOMITE	43,835	0.022	43,034	0.022	\$29,089	0.122	\$29,302	0.112	\$29,647	0.102
162 NIGOMITE	42,553	0.012	40	0.002	\$29,545	0.122	\$29,889	0.112	\$29,888	0.102
163 NIGOMITE	43,630	0.012	40	0.002	\$27,889	0.112	\$28,213	0.102	\$28,483	0.102
164 NIGOMITE	\$20,503	0.112	40	0.002	\$30,388	0.122	\$30,652	0.112	\$30,889	0.112
165 NIGOMITE	\$13,034	0.072	\$10,355	0.082	\$31,116	0.122	\$31,395	0.112	\$31,501	0.112
166 NIGOMITE	40	0.032	40	0.002	\$29,545	0.122	\$29,889	0.112	\$29,889	0.102
167 NIGOMITE	\$15,967	0.032	\$14,176	0.032	\$29,117	0.102	\$29,275	0.092	\$29,409	0.092
168 NIGOMITE	43,128	0.012	\$2,322	0.022	\$23,962	0.092	\$24,220	0.092	\$24,438	0.092
169 NIGOMITE	\$10,989	0.052	\$10,727	0.082	\$29,462	0.122	\$29,730	0.112	\$29,950	0.102
170 NIGOMITE	41,647	0.002	\$23,208	0.162	\$41,848	0.172	\$41,866	0.162	\$41,881	0.142
171 NIGOMITE	40	0.002	40	0.002	\$29,545	0.122	\$29,889	0.112	\$29,889	0.102
172 NIGOMITE	41,168	0.002	\$985	0.002	\$29,918	0.092	\$30,185	0.082	\$30,411	0.082
173 NIGOMITE	\$46,186	0.242	\$38,515	0.322	\$83,803	0.342	\$83,839	0.322	\$83,869	0.292
174 NIGOMITE	\$10,517	0.052	\$8,863	0.072	\$24,498	0.102	\$24,710	0.092	\$24,889	0.092
175 NIGOMITE	\$7,145	0.032	\$10,363	0.082	\$29,182	0.122	\$29,477	0.112	\$29,725	0.102
176 NIGOMITE	\$3,266	0.012	\$2,764	0.022	\$29,545	0.122	\$29,889	0.112	\$29,889	0.102
177 NIGOMITE	\$4,241	0.022	40	0.002	\$28,717	0.112	\$29,051	0.112	\$29,334	0.102
178 NIGOMITE	\$7,808	0.042	\$6,751	0.052	\$28,717	0.112	\$29,051	0.112	\$29,334	0.102
179 NIGOMITE	\$79,721	0.402	\$67,644	0.562	\$118,144	0.492	\$118,194	0.452	\$118,236	0.422
180 NIGOMITE	\$8,382	0.042	\$9,792	0.082	\$28,717	0.112	\$29,051	0.112	\$29,334	0.102
181 NIGOMITE	\$7,398	0.032	\$6,204	0.052	\$29,920	0.092	\$30,106	0.082	\$30,263	0.082
182 NIGOMITE	\$8,195	0.042	\$7,340	0.062	\$29,182	0.122	\$29,477	0.112	\$29,725	0.102
183 NIGOMITE	\$12,888	0.062	\$9,901	0.082	\$29,545	0.122	\$29,889	0.112	\$29,889	0.102
184 NIGOMITE	\$9,321	0.052	40	0.002	\$29,545	0.122	\$29,889	0.112	\$29,889	0.102
185 NIGOMITE	\$22,021	0.112	\$24,323	0.202	\$46,390	0.192	\$46,410	0.172	\$46,426	0.162
186 NIGOMITE	40	0.002	40	0.002	\$28,717	0.112	\$29,051	0.112	\$29,334	0.102
187 NIGOMITE	\$11,037	0.052	\$11,813	0.092	\$29,454	0.122	\$29,725	0.112	\$29,954	0.102
188 NIGOMITE	40	0.002	\$3,782	0.032	\$29,545	0.122	\$29,889	0.112	\$29,889	0.102
189 NIGOMITE	\$4,934	0.042	\$7,398	0.062	\$28,717	0.112	\$29,051	0.112	\$29,334	0.102
190 NIGOMITE	\$29,895	0.162	\$25,194	0.202	\$36,801	0.152	\$36,801	0.142	\$36,810	0.132
191 NIGOMITE	\$5,938	0.032	\$9,229	0.062	\$29,719	0.122	\$29,967	0.112	\$30,176	0.102
192 NIGOMITE	\$5,046	0.022	\$4,414	0.032	\$23,215	0.092	\$23,457	0.092	\$23,661	0.082
193 NIGOMITE	\$15,619	0.032	\$15,665	0.032	\$29,697	0.122	\$29,934	0.112	\$30,008	0.102
194 NIGOMITE	\$10,325	0.032	\$8,701	0.072	\$28,717	0.112	\$29,051	0.112	\$29,334	0.102
195 NIGOMITE	\$4,553	0.022	\$3,405	0.022	\$44,761	0.182	\$44,817	0.172	\$44,803	0.162
196 NIGOMITE	\$6,761	0.032	\$7,159	0.052	\$28,717	0.112	\$29,051	0.112	\$29,334	0.102
197 NIGOMITE	\$35,858	0.192	\$23,882	0.292	\$32,150	0.132	\$32,189	0.122	\$32,231	0.112
198 NIGOMITE	40	0.002	\$3,974	0.032	\$29,545	0.122	\$29,889	0.112	\$29,889	0.102
199 NIGOMITE	40	0.002	40	0.002	\$27,889	0.112	\$28,213	0.102	\$28,483	0.102
200 NIGOMITE	40	0.002	40	0.002	\$114,293	0.472	\$114,293	0.472	\$114,293	0.462
201 NIGOMITE	\$63,864	0.322	\$51,614	0.432	\$47,889	0.112	\$47,889	0.112	\$47,889	0.102
202 NIGOMITE	40	0.002	40	0.002	\$30,132	0.122	\$30,132	0.122	\$30,132	0.112
203 NIGOMITE	40	0.002	\$4,276	0.022	\$29,545	0.122	\$29,889	0.112	\$29,889	0.102
204 NIGOMITE	\$3,732	0.012	40	0.002	\$29,000	0.092	\$29,000	0.092	\$29,000	0.082
205 NIGOMITE	40	0.002	40	0.002	40	0.002	40	0.002	40	0.002

\$13,000,475

\$12,000,326

\$24,000,000

\$2,000,000

\$28,000,000



ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
RESEARCH AGENCY

Pouch Y, State Capitol
Juneau, Alaska 99811
(907) 465-3991

MEMORANDUM

April 28, 1980

TO: Representative Terry Gardiner

FROM: Jack Kreinheder *JK*
Issues Analyst

RE: CS for House Bill No. 192 (Finance) am
Research Request No. 64

As you requested, I have prepared new computer runs estimating the revenue sharing entitlements for each municipality, as reflected in the version of HB 192 passed by the House on 4/22/80. The following changes were made to the original bill:

1. The total entitlement was increased from \$27 million to \$31 million (Section 12).
2. The hold-harmless provision was extended from three to five years [Section 11(a)(2)].
3. In-lieu-of tax revenues from municipal utilities were included as eligible local revenues for the purpose of determining each municipality's local tax effort [Section 2, Section 29.88.010 (c)(1)(c)].
4. The effective date in the event of a legislative appropriation less than that specified in the bill was changed from 1982 to 1983 (Section 12).
5. The section providing for aid to volunteer fire departments (VFD's) was amended on the House floor to make all VFD's, not just those outside cities or boroughs, eligible for State aid under HB 192 [Section 3, Section 29.89.025(a)].

The entitlement figures in the attached chart should be regarded as preliminary values, primarily because we are still evaluating the fiscal impact of the amendment pertaining to volunteer fire departments. These computer runs, therefore, do not reflect the VFD amendment. In addition,

Representative Gardiner
April 28, 1980
Page 2

it appears that there is a greater number of municipalities which collect in-lieu-of tax revenues from municipal utilities than we had originally believed. In-lieu-of tax revenues have been included for the major municipalities, but we need to contact about 25 local governments to verify the remaining in-lieu-of revenues. A new set of entitlement figures incorporating these revenues, as well as the effect of the VFD amendment, will be prepared as soon as the necessary data can be obtained.

Entitlement Chart

The attached chart presents three entitlement figures for each municipality, together with the percentages of the total entitlement which each figure constitutes. The first two columns contain the population of each local government and its percentage of the state's total population. The next two columns show the revenue sharing entitlement and percentage for each municipality under current law for FY 80, excluding health and hospital entitlements. The following two columns display the local government entitlements under HB 192, also excluding health and hospital funding. The remaining four columns also compare present law and HB 192 entitlements and percentages, but include the funding for health services and hospitals.

JK/dp

Attachment

CS FOR HOUSE BILL NO. 192 (Finance) am
PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF REVENUE SHARING ENTITLEMENTS

HB 192 Entitlement
Excluding Health &
Hospital Funding
(Total = \$22,740,838)

HB 192 Entitlement
Including Health &
Hospital Funding
(Total = \$31,000,000)

LOCAL GOV'T	POPULATION	PERCENTAGE	PRESENT LAW ENTITLEMENT	PERCENTAGE	HB 192 ENTITLEMENT	PERCENTAGE	PRESENT LAW ENTITLEMENT	PERCENTAGE	ENTITLEMENT	PERCENTAGE
BOROUGH'S AND SERVICE AREAS										
1 ANCHORAGE A.W.	204,309	46.07%	\$1,326,915	11.05%	\$4,080,703	17.94%	\$6,632,016	32.77%	\$10,329,393	33.32%
2 CITY S.A.	83,340	18.74%	\$233,840	1.99%	\$273,425	1.20%	\$233,840	1.18%	\$244,674	0.78%
3 EAGLE RIVER	7,532	1.63%	\$42,408	0.35%	\$29,147	0.12%	\$42,408	0.20%	\$26,082	0.08%
4 CHUGIAK	4,845	1.03%	\$27,316	0.22%	\$6,191	0.02%	\$27,316	0.13%	\$5,540	0.01%
5 GIRDWOOD	487	0.10%	\$4,576	0.03%	\$1,230	0.00%	\$4,576	0.02%	\$1,101	0.00%
6 GLEN ALPS	65	0.01%	\$0	0.00%	\$83	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$74	0.00%
7 FIRE S.A.	139,598	42.65%	\$958,835	7.99%	\$698,952	3.07%	\$958,835	4.73%	\$625,456	2.01%
8 ROADS & DRAINAGE	168,826	37.93%	\$433,495	3.65%	\$1,557,745	6.84%	\$433,495	2.16%	\$1,496,712	4.82%
9 POLICE S.A.	185,893	41.82%	\$1,588,798	13.23%	\$990,479	4.35%	\$1,588,798	7.85%	\$886,379	2.85%
10 PARKS & REC.	189,469	42.62%	\$657,039	5.47%	\$280,215	1.23%	\$657,039	3.24%	\$250,750	0.80%
11 P & R/CHUSIAK	12,452	2.80%	\$46,802	0.39%	\$17,712	0.07%	\$46,802	0.23%	\$15,850	0.05%
12 SOLID WASTE S.A.	184,290	41.46%	\$0	0.00%	\$67,683	0.29%	\$0	0.00%	\$60,571	0.19%
13 CHUSIAK/SOLID WASTE	14,476	3.25%	\$0	0.00%	\$2,209	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$1,371	0.00%
14 BUILDING SAFETY	184,216	41.44%	\$0	0.00%	\$103,153	0.45%	\$0	0.00%	\$92,306	0.29%
15 SPECIAL ASSESSMENT	92,239	20.75%	\$21,187	0.17%	\$143,002	0.62%	\$21,187	0.10%	\$132,931	0.42%
		TOTAL	\$5,352,264	44.60%	\$8,251,948	36.23%	\$10,657,365	52.66%	\$14,169,751	45.70%
16 BRISTOL BAY BOROUGH	1,685	0.37%	\$48,670	0.40%	\$118,301	0.52%	\$48,670	0.24%	\$107,733	0.34%
17 SOUTH NAKNEK S.A.	225	0.05%	\$0	0.00%	\$751	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$672	0.00%
		TOTAL	\$48,670	0.40%	\$119,553	0.52%	\$48,670	0.24%	\$108,456	0.34%
18 PATRICKS BOROUGH	66,222	14.89%	\$816,424	6.80%	\$1,504,315	6.61%	\$816,424	4.03%	\$1,300,417	4.33%
19 BALLAINE LAKE	168	0.03%	\$401	0.00%	\$1,303	0.00%	\$401	0.00%	\$1,260	0.00%
20 DIANE	66	0.01%	\$2,074	0.01%	\$4,737	0.02%	\$2,074	0.01%	\$4,779	0.01%
21 WILDVIEW ACRES	77	0.01%	\$11,043	0.09%	\$24,501	0.10%	\$11,043	0.05%	\$24,514	0.07%
22 SOUTH RANCH	438	0.09%	\$3,449	0.02%	\$11,433	0.05%	\$3,449	0.01%	\$11,039	0.03%
23 ENGINEER CREEK	144	0.03%	\$0	0.00%	\$732	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$655	0.00%
24 ESTER LUMP	10	0.00%	\$2,684	0.02%	\$5,947	0.02%	\$2,684	0.01%	\$5,950	0.01%
25 NORTH STAR F.P.	6,500	1.46%	\$42,143	0.35%	\$18,868	0.08%	\$42,143	0.20%	\$16,884	0.05%
26 BECKER RIDGE	103	0.02%	\$3,519	0.07%	\$19,295	0.08%	\$3,519	0.04%	\$19,263	0.06%
27 UNIVERSITY F.P.	7,177	1.61%	\$46,533	0.38%	\$45,131	0.19%	\$46,533	0.22%	\$40,385	0.13%
28 LAMBOY HILL	50	0.01%	\$3,617	0.03%	\$9,933	0.04%	\$3,617	0.01%	\$9,736	0.03%
29 SPRUCE ACRES	50	0.01%	\$816	0.00%	\$1,915	0.00%	\$816	0.00%	\$1,305	0.00%
		TOTAL	\$937,714	7.81%	\$1,648,174	7.24%	\$937,714	4.63%	\$1,496,792	4.82%
30 HAINES BOROUGH	1,924	0.43%	\$2,200	0.01%	\$24,043	0.10%	\$2,200	0.01%	\$23,593	0.07%

31	JUNEAU BOROUGH A.W.	23,115	5.20%	\$242,042	2.01%	\$1,039,553	4.57%	\$417,940	2.06%	\$1,117,755	3.60%
32	S.A. 1	7,372	1.65%	\$124,108	1.03%	\$240,939	1.05%	\$124,108	0.61%	\$219,364	0.70%
33	S.A. 2	1,667	0.37%	\$29,893	0.24%	\$46,499	0.11%	\$29,893	0.14%	\$24,392	0.08%
34	S.A. 3	206	0.04%	\$40,266	0.33%	\$96,879	0.42%	\$40,266	0.19%	\$96,129	0.31%
35	S.A. 4	1,591	0.35%	\$8,970	0.07%	\$5,870	0.02%	\$8,970	0.04%	\$5,253	0.01%
36	S.A. 5	10,490	2.36%	\$59,141	0.49%	\$42,677	0.18%	\$59,141	0.29%	\$38,191	0.12%
37	S.A. 6	766	0.17%	\$4,318	0.03%	\$2,223	0.00%	\$4,318	0.02%	\$1,929	0.00%
38	S.A. 7	450	0.10%	\$2,537	0.02%	\$678	0.00%	\$2,537	0.01%	\$607	0.00%
39	S.A. 8	573	0.12%	\$3,230	0.02%	\$639	0.00%	\$3,230	0.01%	\$572	0.00%
TOTAL		\$514,509	4.28%	\$1,455,965	6.40%	\$690,407	3.41%	\$1,504,556	4.85%		

40	KENAI PENINSULA BOROUGH	25,507	5.73%	\$41,224	0.34%	\$305,437	1.34%	\$41,224	0.20%	\$274,205	0.89%
41	CENTRAL HOSPITAL	16,466	3.70%	\$0	0.00%	\$7,917	0.03%	\$60,607	0.29%	\$7,979	0.02%
42	SOUTH HOSPITAL	6,282	1.41%	\$0	0.00%	\$1,127	0.07%	\$60,607	0.29%	\$89,331	0.28%
43	NIKISKI F.P.	3,510	0.78%	\$21,273	0.17%	\$9,642	0.04%	\$21,273	0.10%	\$8,628	0.02%
44	NORTH KENAI REC.	3,822	0.85%	\$15,442	0.12%	\$6,757	0.02%	\$15,442	0.07%	\$6,047	0.01%
45	BEAR CREEK F.P.	660	0.14%	\$4,000	0.03%	\$6,985	0.03%	\$4,000	0.01%	\$6,250	0.02%
TOTAL		\$81,940	0.68%	\$354,857	1.56%	\$203,156	1.00%	\$392,443	1.26%		
46	KETCHIKAN BOROUGH	13,463	3.02%	\$70,843	0.59%	\$275,443	1.21%	\$70,843	0.35%	\$246,480	0.79%
47	SKRELINE S.A.	703	0.15%	\$3,963	0.03%	\$2,223	0.00%	\$3,963	0.01%	\$1,589	0.00%
TOTAL		\$74,806	0.62%	\$277,667	1.22%	\$74,806	0.36%	\$248,469	0.80%		

48	KODIAK ISLAND BOROUGH	8,926	2.00%	\$23,117	0.19%	\$109,300	0.48%	\$148,075	0.73%	\$243,812	0.78%
49	FIRE DISTRICT 1	1,759	0.39%	\$10,661	0.08%	\$5,728	0.02%	\$10,661	0.05%	\$5,125	0.01%
50	ROAD DISTRICT	352	0.07%	\$18,182	0.15%	\$43,369	0.19%	\$18,182	0.08%	\$43,070	0.13%
TOTAL		\$52,591	0.43%	\$153,397	0.69%	\$176,919	0.87%	\$232,008	0.94%		

51	MAT-SU BOROUGH	23,177	5.21%	\$345,104	2.87%	\$793,362	3.48%	\$345,104	1.70%	\$758,009	2.44%
52	WASILLA F.P.	3,879	0.87%	\$22,689	0.18%	\$4,523	0.01%	\$22,689	0.11%	\$4,048	0.01%
53	BUITE F.P.	2,506	0.56%	\$14,658	0.12%	\$2,804	0.01%	\$14,658	0.07%	\$2,509	0.00%
54	GREATER PALMER F.P.	3,027	0.68%	\$20,911	0.17%	\$0	0.00%	\$20,911	0.10%	\$0	0.00%
55	SUTTON F.P.	818	0.18%	\$4,784	0.03%	\$2,211	0.00%	\$4,784	0.02%	\$1,978	0.00%
56	NON AREA-WIDE	17,810	4.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$11,717	0.05%	\$0	0.00%	\$10,485	0.03%
57	TALKEETHA FLOOD S.A.	308	0.06%	\$0	0.00%	\$1,263	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$1,130	0.00%
58	GARDEN TERRACE	79	0.01%	\$0	0.00%	\$712	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$637	0.00%
TOTAL		\$408,149	3.40%	\$816,594	3.59%	\$408,149	2.01%	\$778,799	2.51%		

59	NORTH SLOPE BOROUGH	8,055	1.81%	\$203,508	1.63%	\$226,194	0.99%	\$231,661	1.14%	\$247,645	0.79%
60	SITKA BOROUGH	8,737	1.97%	\$234,649	1.95%	\$50,643	1.10%	\$319,327	1.57%	\$322,974	1.04%

FIRST CLASS CITIES											
61	BARROW	2,715	0.61%	\$34,122	0.28%	\$57,910	0.25%	\$34,122	0.16%	\$51,821	0.16%
62	CODINA	2,730	0.62%	\$31,271	0.76%	\$168,643	0.74%	\$171,288	0.84%	\$253,349	0.81%
63	CRAG	587	0.13%	\$19,356	0.16%	\$46,103	0.20%	\$22,863	0.11%	\$46,439	0.14%
64	DILLINGHAM	1,658	0.37%	\$62,407	0.52%	\$82,523	0.36%	\$62,407	0.30%	\$76,118	0.24%
65	FALLENBURG	36,637	8.24%	\$709,941	5.91%	\$1,645,959	7.25%	\$1,117,319	10.46%	\$3,099,185	9.39%
66	GALINA	957	0.21%	\$33,914	0.28%	\$33,842	0.14%	\$37,935	0.18%	\$37,885	0.12%
67	HAIKES	1,366	0.30%	\$49,634	0.41%	\$84,862	0.37%	\$49,634	0.24%	\$78,922	0.25%
68	HOMER	2,227	0.50%	\$69,574	0.57%	\$82,835	0.36%	\$76,039	0.37%	\$85,778	0.27%
69	HELVEN	1,093	0.24%	\$32,671	0.27%	\$38,768	0.17%	\$39,136	0.19%	\$44,417	0.14%
70	HELVENBURG	381	0.08%	\$9,732	0.08%	\$2,868	0.10%	\$12,739	0.06%	\$23,387	0.07%

71 KADE	710	0.15%	\$18,967	0.15%	\$25,008	0.11%	\$18,967	0.09%	\$24,279	0.07%
72 KATAI	4,421	0.93%	\$166,757	1.38%	\$354,773	1.56%	\$166,757	0.82%	\$330,175	1.06%
73 KATLIAN	8,542	1.92%	\$208,143	1.73%	\$484,876	2.13%	\$305,179	1.50%	\$550,128	1.77%
74 KING COVE	733	0.16%	\$21,913	0.18%	\$27,652	0.12%	\$25,709	0.12%	\$28,318	0.09%
75 KLASOCK	404	0.09%	\$10,560	0.08%	\$22,417	0.09%	\$13,567	0.06%	\$22,940	0.07%
76 KODIAK	5,754	1.29%	\$164,263	1.36%	\$203,390	0.89%	\$164,263	0.81%	\$186,174	0.60%
77 KULANA	503	0.11%	\$28,578	0.23%	\$66,010	0.29%	\$28,578	0.14%	\$62,944	0.20%
78 KOME	2,892	0.65%	\$111,941	0.93%	\$223,023	0.98%	\$208,794	1.03%	\$320,436	1.03%
79 KORT POLE	823	0.18%	\$29,197	0.24%	\$50,611	0.22%	\$29,197	0.14%	\$48,547	0.15%
80 PALMER	2,056	0.46%	\$65,141	0.54%	\$135,854	0.59%	\$126,841	0.62%	\$204,586	0.65%
81 PELICAN	221	0.04%	\$4,816	0.04%	\$23,905	0.10%	\$8,048	0.03%	\$24,469	0.07%
82 PETERSBURG	3,197	0.71%	\$94,268	0.78%	\$192,601	0.84%	\$163,987	0.81%	\$260,863	0.84%
83 SAND POINT	773	0.17%	\$27,161	0.22%	\$46,760	0.20%	\$30,958	0.15%	\$49,556	0.15%
84 SAINT MARY'S	436	0.09%	\$32,119	0.26%	\$48,686	0.21%	\$36,028	0.17%	\$53,142	0.17%
85 SELDOVIA	528	0.11%	\$20,441	0.17%	\$37,247	0.16%	\$23,374	0.11%	\$39,466	0.12%
86 SEWARD	1,778	0.40%	\$64,622	0.53%	\$118,790	0.52%	\$183,054	0.90%	\$265,031	0.85%
87 SKAGWAY	877	0.19%	\$33,840	0.28%	\$54,128	0.23%	\$37,072	0.18%	\$55,429	0.17%
88 SOLOUTNA	2,365	0.53%	\$91,572	0.76%	\$177,599	0.85%	\$91,572	0.45%	\$180,594	0.58%
89 UNALASKA	768	0.17%	\$72,551	0.60%	\$195,585	0.86%	\$82,041	0.40%	\$200,445	0.64%
90 VALDEZ	4,066	0.91%	\$137,150	1.14%	\$136,861	0.60%	\$214,931	1.06%	\$214,644	0.69%
91 ZONE I	3,631	0.81%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%
92 ZONE II	380	0.08%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%
TOTAL			\$137,150	1.14%	\$136,861	0.60%	\$214,931	1.06%	\$214,644	0.69%
93 WRANGELL	3,325	0.74%	\$95,108	0.79%	\$197,470	0.86%	\$161,908	0.80%	\$260,489	0.84%
94 ZONE II	997	0.22%	\$0	0.00%	\$21,600	0.09%	\$0	0.00%	\$19,328	0.06%
96 ZONE IV	2,328	0.52%	\$0	0.00%	\$77,591	0.34%	\$0	0.00%	\$69,432	0.22%
TOTAL			\$95,108	0.79%	\$296,662	1.30%	\$161,908	0.80%	\$349,251	1.12%
97 YAKUTAT	442	0.09%	\$11,691	0.09%	\$24,629	0.10%	\$14,924	0.07%	\$25,187	0.08%
SECOND CLASS CITIES										
98 AKHIOK	121	0.02%	\$6,071	0.05%	\$24,854	0.10%	\$6,071	0.03%	\$24,891	0.08%
99 AKTACHAK	354	0.07%	\$19,322	0.16%	\$31,402	0.13%	\$25,040	0.12%	\$32,287	0.10%
100 AKIAK	216	0.04%	\$3,588	0.02%	\$28,474	0.12%	\$7,497	0.03%	\$29,159	0.09%
101 AKOLMIUT	641	0.14%	\$57,837	0.48%	\$87,078	0.38%	\$65,655	0.32%	\$97,532	0.31%
102 ALAKANUK	527	0.11%	\$23,029	0.19%	\$31,006	0.13%	\$26,938	0.13%	\$31,671	0.10%
103 ALEKAGNIK	227	0.05%	\$5,278	0.04%	\$27,652	0.12%	\$5,278	0.02%	\$27,708	0.08%
104 ALLAKAKET	216	0.04%	\$6,786	0.05%	\$30,394	0.13%	\$10,808	0.05%	\$31,091	0.10%
105 ANGLER	217	0.04%	\$13,654	0.11%	\$31,420	0.13%	\$17,676	0.08%	\$32,108	0.10%
106 ANAKTOVUK PASS	173	0.03%	\$0	0.00%	\$29,295	0.12%	\$0	0.00%	\$29,354	0.09%
107 ANDERSON	698	0.15%	\$13,734	0.11%	\$31,331	0.13%	\$13,734	0.06%	\$31,373	0.10%
108 ANSON	541	0.12%	\$20,195	0.16%	\$24,360	0.10%	\$23,314	0.11%	\$24,894	0.08%
109 ANIAK	355	0.07%	\$25,938	0.21%	\$38,038	0.16%	\$29,959	0.14%	\$43,410	0.14%
110 ANPIK	102	0.02%	\$0	0.00%	\$29,295	0.12%	\$0	0.00%	\$29,354	0.09%
111 AWAHTILIAK	200	0.04%	\$17,981	0.14%	\$37,035	0.14%	\$21,890	0.10%	\$34,404	0.11%
112 BETHEL	3,853	0.86%	\$183,321	1.52%	\$255,780	1.12%	\$295,115	1.16%	\$311,094	1.00%
113 BREWIG MISSION	147	0.03%	\$2,801	0.02%	\$28,474	0.12%	\$6,710	0.03%	\$29,159	0.09%
114 BUCKLAND	170	0.03%	\$2,995	0.02%	\$29,295	0.12%	\$6,927	0.03%	\$30,001	0.09%
115 CHESTERNAK	206	0.04%	\$3,925	0.03%	\$28,474	0.12%	\$7,834	0.03%	\$29,159	0.09%
116 CHULAK	468	0.10%	\$12,852	0.10%	\$28,672	0.12%	\$16,761	0.08%	\$29,356	0.09%
117 CHUATHALUK	127	0.02%	\$10,321	0.08%	\$31,168	0.13%	\$14,343	0.07%	\$31,858	0.10%
118 CLARK'S POINT	93	0.02%	\$0	0.00%	\$27,652	0.12%	\$0	0.00%	\$27,708	0.08%
119 DELTA JUNCTION	892	0.20%	\$22,320	0.18%	\$28,195	0.12%	\$25,777	0.12%	\$29,257	0.09%
120 DISBURD	125	0.02%	\$890	0.00%	\$27,652	0.12%	\$4,686	0.02%	\$28,318	0.09%

121 EAGLE	142	0.03%	\$3,674	\$26,014	0.11%	\$3,674	0.01%	\$26,059	0.03%
122 EER	307	0.06%	\$7,350	\$28,474	0.12%	\$11,259	0.05%	\$29,159	0.03%
123 EKIMOK	111	0.02%	\$0	\$27,652	0.12%	\$0	0.00%	\$27,708	0.08%
124 EL IN	218	0.04%	\$4,580	\$29,474	0.12%	\$8,483	0.04%	\$29,159	0.09%
125 ELMENAK	545	0.12%	\$16,449	\$29,823	0.13%	\$20,358	0.10%	\$30,408	0.09%
126 FORTI YUKON	637	0.12%	\$40,167	\$51,318	0.22%	\$4,189	0.21%	\$56,701	0.18%
127 FORTUNA LEDGE	263	0.05%	\$13,260	\$30,353	0.13%	\$17,169	0.08%	\$31,024	0.10%
128 GAMBELL	447	0.10%	\$18,779	\$31,244	0.13%	\$18,779	0.09%	\$31,279	0.10%
129 GULOVIN	118	0.02%	\$2,825	\$28,474	0.12%	\$6,734	0.03%	\$29,159	0.09%
130 GULL NEWS BAY	243	0.05%	\$0	\$28,474	0.12%	\$0	0.00%	\$28,531	0.09%
131 GRAYLING	181	0.04%	\$7,465	\$30,598	0.13%	\$7,465	0.03%	\$30,547	0.09%
132 HAI Y CROSS	302	0.06%	\$10,435	\$30,924	0.13%	\$14,457	0.07%	\$31,616	0.10%
133 HAWKER BAY	610	0.13%	\$10,133	\$28,474	0.12%	\$10,133	0.05%	\$28,531	0.09%
134 HOUSTON	440	0.09%	\$34,179	\$66,130	0.29%	\$34,179	0.16%	\$66,181	0.21%
135 HUGHES	98	0.02%	\$1,231	\$29,295	0.12%	\$1,231	0.00%	\$29,354	0.09%
136 HUSLIA	212	0.04%	\$20,890	\$53,243	0.26%	\$33,912	0.16%	\$64,632	0.20%
137 KACHENAK	151	0.03%	\$0	\$23,545	0.10%	\$0	0.00%	\$23,593	0.07%
138 KAKTOVIK	192	0.04%	\$2,413	\$29,295	0.12%	\$2,413	0.01%	\$29,354	0.09%
139 KALTAG	257	0.05%	\$6,763	\$30,109	0.13%	\$6,763	0.03%	\$30,162	0.09%
140 KASAAK	46	0.01%	\$432	\$21,903	0.09%	\$3,439	0.01%	\$22,430	0.07%
141 KIAMA	344	0.07%	\$13,720	\$30,525	0.13%	\$17,741	0.08%	\$31,220	0.10%
142 KIVALINA	264	0.05%	\$6,503	\$29,295	0.12%	\$10,524	0.05%	\$30,001	0.09%
143 KVOJUK	61	0.01%	\$7,535	\$30,924	0.13%	\$11,557	0.05%	\$31,616	0.10%
144 KOTLIK	305	0.06%	\$5,066	\$28,474	0.12%	\$8,975	0.04%	\$29,159	0.09%
145 KOTZEBUE	2,526	0.56%	\$111,653	\$136,554	0.60%	\$111,653	0.55%	\$128,423	0.41%
146 KOYUK	178	0.04%	\$5,126	\$28,707	0.12%	\$9,035	0.04%	\$29,391	0.09%
147 KOYUKUK	124	0.02%	\$935	\$29,295	0.12%	\$0	0.00%	\$30,001	0.09%
148 KUPREANOF	42	0.00%	\$474	\$28,724	0.09%	\$474	0.00%	\$29,770	0.07%
149 KWETHLIK	444	0.09%	\$10,630	\$28,474	0.12%	\$14,539	0.07%	\$29,159	0.09%
150 LARSEN BAY	133	0.02%	\$1,343	\$29,545	0.10%	\$1,343	0.00%	\$29,593	0.07%
151 LOWER KALSKAG	223	0.05%	\$46,218	\$88,756	0.39%	\$50,240	0.24%	\$94,168	0.30%
152 MACHKOTAK	250	0.05%	\$5,101	\$27,652	0.12%	\$8,897	0.04%	\$28,318	0.09%
153 MCGRATH	382	0.08%	\$21,926	\$39,467	0.14%	\$25,948	0.12%	\$33,146	0.10%
154 MEGOVUK	174	0.03%	\$4,165	\$28,474	0.12%	\$8,074	0.03%	\$29,159	0.09%
155 MOUNTAIN VILLAGE	543	0.12%	\$35,024	\$46,377	0.20%	\$38,933	0.19%	\$51,606	0.16%
156 NAPAKTAK	313	0.07%	\$11,129	\$29,455	0.12%	\$15,038	0.07%	\$30,133	0.09%
157 NAPASKIAK	240	0.05%	\$5,042	\$28,474	0.12%	\$9,928	0.04%	\$29,280	0.09%
158 NEWALLEN	105	0.02%	\$0	\$27,652	0.12%	\$0	0.00%	\$27,708	0.08%
159 NEW STUYAHOOK	297	0.06%	\$5,355	\$27,652	0.12%	\$9,151	0.04%	\$28,318	0.09%
160 NEWTOK	154	0.03%	\$3,637	\$28,474	0.12%	\$7,506	0.03%	\$29,159	0.09%
161 NIGHIPIE	135	0.03%	\$3,048	\$28,869	0.12%	\$3,048	0.01%	\$28,924	0.09%
162 NIKOLAI	152	0.03%	\$0	\$29,295	0.12%	\$0	0.00%	\$29,334	0.09%
163 NIKOLAI	226	0.05%	\$0	\$27,652	0.12%	\$0	0.00%	\$27,708	0.08%
164 NIKOVOK	526	0.11%	\$17,332	\$30,191	0.13%	\$17,332	0.08%	\$30,243	0.09%
165 NILATIO	332	0.07%	\$10,355	\$30,964	0.13%	\$14,377	0.07%	\$31,656	0.10%
166 NIHEVUI	182	0.04%	\$0	\$29,295	0.12%	\$0	0.00%	\$29,354	0.09%
167 OLD HANDBOR	345	0.07%	\$14,176	\$25,002	0.10%	\$14,176	0.07%	\$25,037	0.08%
168 OULINKIE	177	0.03%	\$2,922	\$23,775	0.10%	\$2,922	0.05%	\$23,820	0.07%
169 PULU STATION	31	0.06%	\$10,727	\$29,265	0.12%	\$10,727	0.05%	\$29,316	0.09%
170 PLAYHEM	58	0.01%	\$20,238	\$41,836	0.18%	\$20,238	0.10%	\$41,869	0.13%
171 POUHI HEDE	464	0.13%	\$0	\$29,295	0.12%	\$0	0.00%	\$29,354	0.09%
172 PORT ALEXANDER	101	0.02%	\$385	\$22,724	0.09%	\$385	0.00%	\$22,770	0.07%
173 PORT HEIDEN	91	0.02%	\$38,515	\$83,779	0.36%	\$42,311	0.20%	\$88,887	0.28%
174 PORT LIONS	232	0.05%	\$8,863	\$24,344	0.10%	\$8,863	0.04%	\$24,385	0.07%
175 QUIMAGAK	448	0.10%	\$10,369	\$28,968	0.08%	\$14,278	0.07%	\$29,650	0.09%

174 BAY	220	0.04%	\$2,764	0.02%	\$29,295	0.12%	\$2,764	0.01%	\$29,354	0.09%
177 BRYAN HISSIN	167	0.03%	\$0	0.00%	\$28,474	0.12%	\$0	0.00%	\$28,531	0.09%
178 SAINT MICHAEL	282	0.06%	\$6,751	0.05%	\$28,474	0.12%	\$10,660	0.05%	\$29,159	0.09%
179 SAINT PAUL	567	0.12%	\$67,644	0.56%	\$118,109	0.51%	\$67,644	0.33%	\$118,201	0.38%
180 SANDS	409	0.09%	\$9,792	0.08%	\$28,474	0.12%	\$13,701	0.06%	\$29,159	0.09%
181 SANDS	272	0.06%	\$6,234	0.05%	\$22,786	0.10%	\$6,234	0.03%	\$22,821	0.07%
182 SANDS BAY	232	0.05%	\$7,840	0.06%	\$28,368	0.12%	\$11,749	0.05%	\$29,650	0.09%
183 SANDS	505	0.11%	\$9,901	0.08%	\$29,295	0.12%	\$9,901	0.04%	\$29,354	0.09%
184 SANDS	223	0.05%	\$0	0.00%	\$29,295	0.12%	\$0	0.00%	\$29,354	0.09%
185 SANDS	160	0.03%	\$24,323	0.20%	\$46,377	0.20%	\$28,232	0.13%	\$51,606	0.16%
186 SANDS POINT	143	0.03%	\$0	0.00%	\$28,474	0.12%	\$0	0.00%	\$28,531	0.09%
187 SANDS	373	0.08%	\$11,833	0.09%	\$29,257	0.12%	\$15,742	0.07%	\$29,936	0.09%
188 SANDS	198	0.04%	\$3,782	0.03%	\$29,295	0.12%	\$7,804	0.03%	\$30,001	0.09%
189 SANDS	309	0.06%	\$7,398	0.06%	\$28,474	0.12%	\$11,307	0.05%	\$29,159	0.09%
190 SANDS	499	0.11%	\$25,194	0.20%	\$36,870	0.16%	\$25,194	0.12%	\$36,899	0.11%
191 SANDS	258	0.05%	\$8,229	0.06%	\$29,538	0.12%	\$12,138	0.05%	\$30,215	0.09%
192 SANDS SPRINGS	141	0.03%	\$4,414	0.03%	\$29,574	0.13%	\$4,414	0.02%	\$29,674	0.07%
193 SANDS	474	0.10%	\$15,665	0.13%	\$28,474	0.12%	\$15,665	0.07%	\$29,159	0.09%
194 SANDS BAY	336	0.07%	\$8,701	0.07%	\$44,755	0.19%	\$30,314	0.14%	\$49,983	0.16%
195 SANDS	258	0.05%	\$26,405	0.22%	\$28,474	0.12%	\$12,610	0.06%	\$29,159	0.09%
196 SANDS	299	0.06%	\$7,159	0.05%	\$28,474	0.12%	\$11,068	0.05%	\$29,159	0.09%
197 SANDS	632	0.14%	\$29,882	0.24%	\$32,122	0.14%	\$33,791	0.16%	\$35,118	0.11%
198 SANDS	166	0.03%	\$3,974	0.03%	\$29,295	0.12%	\$3,974	0.01%	\$29,354	0.09%
199 SANDS	429	0.09%	\$0	0.00%	\$29,295	0.12%	\$0	0.00%	\$29,354	0.09%
200 SANDS	130	0.02%	\$0	0.00%	\$27,652	0.12%	\$0	0.00%	\$27,703	0.08%
201 SANDS	2,184	0.49%	\$51,614	0.43%	\$114,194	0.50%	\$51,614	0.25%	\$114,283	0.36%
202 SANDS MOUNTAIN	115	0.02%	\$0	0.00%	\$27,652	0.12%	\$0	0.00%	\$27,703	0.08%
203 SANDS	292	0.06%	\$21,567	0.17%	\$30,123	0.13%	\$25,025	0.12%	\$34,741	0.11%
204 SANDS	133	0.02%	\$3,276	0.02%	\$29,295	0.12%	\$7,258	0.03%	\$30,001	0.09%
205 SANDS	1	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$21,903	0.09%	\$52,204	0.25%	\$69,353	0.22%
TOTAL			\$12,000,226		\$22,740,838		\$20,314,511		\$31,000,000	



ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
RESEARCH AGENCY

Pouch Y, State Capitol
Juneau, Alaska 99811
(907) 465-3931

MEMORANDUM

April 30, 1980

TO: Representative Terry Gardiner

FROM: Jack Kreinheder, Issues Analyst *JK*

RE: Impact of Proposed HB 192 Hold Harmless Amendment (125 Percent)
Research Request No. 64

Attached is the computer run you requested for the Senate Community and Regional Affairs Committee, showing the effect on HB 192 revenue sharing entitlements of a provision ensuring that all municipalities would receive at least 125 percent of their 1980 prorated entitlement. The run was made at a funding level of \$31 million and includes hospital and health entitlements.

A total of thirteen municipalities would be affected by a 125 percent hold harmless provision, with the following local governments receiving the most money under such a provision:

1.	Sitka Borough	-	\$72,493
2.	City of Valdez	-	\$51,535
3.	North Slope Borough	-	\$39,253
4.	City of Kodiak	-	\$17,256

The total cost or the amount that other communities would lose from this hold harmless amendment would be about \$225,000. The cost would be distributed equally over all municipalities on a percentage basis, with each municipality not benefitting from the hold harmless provision incurring a reduction of about one percent (.01) in its revenue sharing entitlement.

One final point is that as HB 192 is written, providing a 125 percent hold harmless clause would result in an actual entitlement increase for affected municipalities of about 24 percent. This is a result of the existing hold harmless language, which states that the additional hold

Representative Terry Gardiner

Page No. 2

April 30, 1980

harmless monies shall be prorated along with all other entitlements to fund the hold harmless entitlements. In order to guarantee an actual increase of 25 percent over the current entitlement, the hold harmless level would need to be set at about 126 percent, or the proration mechanism could be changed so that the hold harmless entitlements were not prorated.

JK/bf

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF POPULATION AND ENTITLEMENTS

*****INCLUDING REP. GARDINER'S PROPOSED 125% HILD HARMLESS AMENDMENT*****

PREPARED BY
HOUSE RESEARCH AGENCY
APRIL 30, 1980

NOTE: MUSA'S INCLUDED: HEALTH & HOSP. INCLUDED
TOTAL ENTITLEMENT = \$31,000,000
CHAPTER 83 PROPORTION FACTOR = 2.704663794016
MINIMUM ENT. PROPORTION FACTOR = .873065571238
HILD HARMLESS PROPORTION FACTOR = .9307521017207
MUNICIPAL POPULATION = 444,481

BOROUGH AND SERVICE AREAS	POPULATION PERCENTAGE	PRESENT LAW		HD 192		
		ENTITLEMENT PERCENTAGE	ENTITLEMENT	ENTITLEMENT PERCENTAGE	ENTITLEMENT	
1 ANCHORAGE A.W.	204,809	46.07%	\$6,632,016	32.77%	\$10,236,611	33.02%
2 CITY S.A.	83,340	18.74%	\$239,840	1.18%	\$242,003	0.78%
3 EAGLE RIVER	7,522	1.63%	\$42,408	0.20%	\$25,737	0.08%
4 CHUGIAK	4,845	1.09%	\$27,316	0.13%	\$5,480	0.01%
5 GIRDWOOD	487	0.10%	\$4,576	0.02%	\$1,083	0.00%
6 GLEN ALP	65	0.01%	\$0	0.00%	\$74	0.00%
7 FIRE S.A.	189,598	42.65%	\$358,835	4.73%	\$618,628	1.93%
8 ROADS & DRAINAGE	168,826	37.98%	\$438,495	2.16%	\$1,483,278	4.78%
9 POLICE S.A.	185,893	41.82%	\$1,588,798	7.85%	\$876,653	2.82%
10 PARKS & REC.	189,469	42.62%	\$657,089	3.24%	\$248,011	0.80%
11 P & R/CHUGIAK	12,452	2.80%	\$46,802	0.23%	\$15,671	0.05%
12 SOLID WASTE S.A.	184,290	41.46%	\$0	0.00%	\$59,910	0.19%
13 CHUGIAK/SOLID WASTE	14,476	3.25%	\$0	0.00%	\$1,355	0.00%
14 BUILDING SAFETY	184,216	41.44%	\$0	0.00%	\$31,239	0.29%
15 SPECIAL ASSESSMENT	92,239	20.75%	\$21,187	0.10%	\$131,620	0.42%
TOTAL	1,685,225	0.37%	\$48,670	0.24%	\$106,648	0.34%
16 BRISTOL BAY BOROUGH	225	0.05%	\$0	0.00%	\$665	0.00%
17 SOUTH MAKER S.A.	225	0.05%	\$0	0.00%	\$665	0.00%
TOTAL	444,481	0.10%	\$48,670	0.24%	\$107,314	0.34%
18 FAIRBANKS BOROUGH	66,222	14.89%	\$816,424	4.03%	\$1,345,971	4.34%
19 BALLAINE LAKE	168	0.03%	\$401	0.00%	\$1,249	0.00%
20 DYANE	66	0.01%	\$2,074	0.01%	\$4,740	0.01%
21 WILLOW ACRES	77	0.01%	\$11,048	0.05%	\$24,320	0.07%
22 SMITH RANCH	438	0.09%	\$3,443	0.01%	\$10,341	0.03%
23 ENGINEER CREEK	144	0.03%	\$0	0.00%	\$648	0.00%
24 ESTER LIMP	10	0.00%	\$2,684	0.01%	\$5,303	0.01%
25 NORTH STAR F.P.	6,500	1.46%	\$42,143	0.20%	\$16,639	0.05%
26 BECKER RIDGE	108	0.02%	\$8,519	0.04%	\$19,103	0.06%
27 UNIVERSITY F.P.	7,177	1.61%	\$46,533	0.22%	\$39,344	0.12%
28 LAKLOVEY HILL	50	0.01%	\$3,617	0.01%	\$9,654	0.03%
29 SPRUCE ACRES	50	0.01%	\$816	0.00%	\$1,830	0.00%
TOTAL	1,324	0.43%	\$337,714	4.63%	\$1,481,073	4.77%
30 HAINES BOROUGH	1,324	0.43%	\$2,200	0.01%	\$21,406	0.07%
31 JUNEAU BOROUGH A.W.	23,115	5.20%	\$417,940	2.06%	\$1,106,114	3.56%
32 S.A. 1	7,372	1.65%	\$124,108	0.61%	\$217,076	0.70%
33 S.A. 2	1,667	0.37%	\$29,893	0.14%	\$24,755	0.07%
34 S.A. 3	206	0.04%	\$40,266	0.19%	\$35,347	0.30%
35 S.A. 4	1,591	0.35%	\$8,970	0.04%	\$5,136	0.01%
36 S.A. 5	10,430	2.36%	\$59,141	0.29%	\$37,774	0.12%
37 S.A. 6	766	0.17%	\$4,318	0.02%	\$1,367	0.00%
38 S.A. 7	450	0.10%	\$2,537	0.01%	\$600	0.00%

40 KENAI PENINSULA BOROUGH	25,507	5.73%	\$41,224	0.20%	\$271,212	0.87%
41 CENTRAL HOSPITAL	16,466	3.70%	\$60,607	0.29%	\$7,892	0.02%
42 SOUTH HOSPITAL	6,282	1.41%	\$60,607	0.29%	\$8,580	0.28%
43 NIKISKI F.P.	3,510	0.78%	\$21,273	0.10%	\$8,534	0.02%
44 NORTH KENAI REC.	3,822	0.85%	\$15,442	0.07%	\$5,981	0.01%
45 BEAR CREEK F.P.	660	0.14%	\$4,000	0.01%	\$6,182	0.01%
TOTAL			\$203,156	1.00%	1,388,383	1.25%

46 KETCHIKAN BOROUGH	13,463	3.02%	\$70,843	0.35%	\$243,789	0.78%
47 SHORELINE S.A.	703	0.15%	\$3,963	0.01%	\$1,367	0.00%
TOTAL			\$74,806	0.36%	\$245,156	0.79%

48 KODIAK ISLAND BOROUGH	8,926	2.00%	\$148,075	0.73%	\$241,587	0.77%
49 FIRE DISTRICT 1	1,759	0.39%	\$10,661	0.05%	\$5,069	0.01%
50 ROAD DISTRICT	352	0.07%	\$18,182	0.08%	\$42,720	0.13%
TOTAL			\$176,919	0.87%	\$289,377	0.93%

51 MAT-SU BOROUGH	23,177	5.21%	\$345,104	1.70%	\$751,093	2.42%
52 WASILLA F.P.	3,879	0.87%	\$22,689	0.11%	\$4,003	0.01%
53 BUTTE F.P.	2,506	0.56%	\$14,658	0.07%	\$2,482	0.00%
54 GREATER PALMER F.P.	3,027	0.68%	\$20,911	0.10%	\$0	0.00%
55 SUTTON F.P.	818	0.18%	\$4,784	0.02%	\$1,357	0.00%
56 NON AREA-WIDE	17,810	4.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$10,370	0.03%
57 TALLEKINA FLOOD S.A.	308	0.06%	\$0	0.00%	\$1,117	0.00%
58 GARDEN TERRACE	79	0.01%	\$0	0.00%	\$630	0.00%
TOTAL			\$408,149	2.01%	\$771,656	2.48%

59 NORTH SLOPE BOROUGH	8,055	1.81%	\$231,661	1.14%	\$286,898	0.92%
60 SITKA BOROUGH	8,787	1.97%	\$319,327	1.57%	\$395,467	1.27%

FIRST CLASS CITIES

61 BARRON	2,715	0.61%	\$34,122	0.16%	\$51,255	0.16%
62 CONDOVA	2,760	0.62%	\$171,288	0.84%	\$250,953	0.80%
63 CRAIG	587	0.13%	\$22,863	0.11%	\$45,978	0.14%
64 DILLINGHAM	1,658	0.37%	\$62,407	0.30%	\$77,288	0.24%
65 FAIRBANKS	36,637	8.24%	\$2,117,319	10.46%	\$3,070,885	9.90%
66 GALENA	957	0.21%	\$37,935	0.18%	\$46,981	0.15%
67 HAINES	1,366	0.30%	\$49,634	0.24%	\$78,145	0.25%
68 HOMER	2,227	0.50%	\$76,039	0.37%	\$94,169	0.30%
69 HOONAH	1,093	0.24%	\$39,136	0.19%	\$48,468	0.15%
70 HYDABURG	381	0.08%	\$12,739	0.06%	\$23,202	0.07%
71 KAKE	710	0.15%	\$18,967	0.09%	\$24,043	0.07%
72 KENAI	4,421	0.93%	\$166,757	0.82%	\$326,930	1.05%
73 KETCHIKAN	8,542	1.92%	\$405,179	1.50%	\$586,485	1.83%
74 KING COVE	733	0.16%	\$25,709	0.12%	\$31,840	0.10%
75 KLAWDOCK	404	0.09%	\$13,567	0.06%	\$22,758	0.07%
76 KODIAK	5,754	1.29%	\$164,263	0.81%	\$203,430	0.65%
77 NEMANA	2,892	0.65%	\$208,794	1.03%	\$217,451	0.20%
78 NOME	2,823	0.65%	\$29,197	0.14%	\$48,109	0.15%
79 NORTH POLE	2,056	0.46%	\$126,841	0.62%	\$202,735	0.65%
80 PALMER	221	0.04%	\$8,043	0.03%	\$24,275	0.07%
81 PELICAN	3,197	0.71%	\$163,987	0.81%	\$258,344	0.83%
82 PETERSBURG	773	0.17%	\$30,958	0.15%	\$49,105	0.15%
83 SAND POINT	436	0.09%	\$36,028	0.17%	\$52,701	0.17%
84 SAINT MARY'S	528	0.11%	\$23,674	0.11%	\$39,100	0.12%
85 SELDIVIA	1,778	0.40%	\$183,054	0.90%	\$262,744	0.84%
86 SEWARD						

87	SKAGWAY	877	0.19%	\$37,072	0.19%	\$54,913	0.17%
88	SOLDOTNA	2,365	0.53%	\$31,572	0.53%	\$178,830	0.57%
89	UNALASKA	757	0.17%	\$82,041	0.40%	\$198,657	0.64%
90	VALDEZ	4,066	0.91%	\$214,931	1.06%	\$266,179	0.85%
91	ZONE I	3,631	0.81%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%
92	ZONE II	380	0.08%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%
		TOTAL		\$214,931	1.06%	\$266,179	0.85%
93	WRANGELL	3,325	0.74%	\$161,908	0.80%	\$257,945	0.83%
94	ZONE II	997	0.22%	\$0	0.00%	\$19,117	0.06%
95	ZONE IV	2,328	0.52%	\$0	0.00%	\$68,675	0.22%
		TOTAL		\$161,908	0.80%	\$345,738	1.11%
97	YAKUTAT	442	0.09%	\$14,924	0.07%	\$24,987	0.08%
SECOND CLASS CITIES							
98	AKHIOK	121	0.02%	\$6,071	0.03%	\$24,694	0.07%
99	AKTACHAK	354	0.07%	\$25,040	0.12%	\$32,031	0.10%
100	AKIAK	216	0.04%	\$7,497	0.03%	\$28,928	0.09%
101	AKULMIUT	641	0.14%	\$65,655	0.32%	\$96,759	0.31%
102	ALAKANUK	527	0.11%	\$26,938	0.13%	\$33,361	0.10%
103	ALEKNAGIK	227	0.05%	\$8,278	0.02%	\$27,488	0.08%
104	ALLAKAKET	216	0.04%	\$10,808	0.05%	\$30,844	0.09%
105	AMBLER	217	0.04%	\$17,676	0.08%	\$31,854	0.10%
106	ANAKTUVUK PASS	173	0.03%	\$0	0.00%	\$29,121	0.09%
107	ANDERSON	698	0.15%	\$13,734	0.06%	\$31,125	0.10%
108	ANGOON	541	0.12%	\$23,314	0.11%	\$28,873	0.09%
109	ANIAK	355	0.07%	\$29,959	0.14%	\$43,066	0.13%
110	ANVIK	102	0.02%	\$0	0.00%	\$29,121	0.09%
111	ATMAUTLUAK	200	0.04%	\$21,890	0.10%	\$34,131	0.11%
112	BETHEL	3,853	0.86%	\$235,115	1.16%	\$308,282	0.93%
113	BREVIQ MISSION	147	0.03%	\$6,710	0.03%	\$28,928	0.09%
114	BUCKLAND	170	0.03%	\$6,927	0.03%	\$29,762	0.09%
115	CHEFORNAK	206	0.04%	\$7,834	0.03%	\$28,928	0.09%
116	CHEVAK	468	0.10%	\$16,761	0.08%	\$29,121	0.09%
117	CHUATHODALUK	127	0.02%	\$14,343	0.07%	\$31,605	0.10%
118	CLARK'S POINT	98	0.02%	\$0	0.00%	\$27,488	0.08%
119	DELTA JUNCTION	892	0.20%	\$25,777	0.12%	\$31,924	0.10%
120	DIOMEDE	125	0.02%	\$4,686	0.02%	\$28,093	0.09%
121	EAGLE	142	0.03%	\$3,674	0.01%	\$25,852	0.08%
122	EEK	307	0.06%	\$11,259	0.05%	\$28,928	0.09%
123	EKWOK	111	0.02%	\$0	0.00%	\$27,488	0.08%
124	ELIM	218	0.04%	\$8,489	0.04%	\$28,928	0.09%
125	EMMONAK	545	0.12%	\$20,358	0.10%	\$30,256	0.09%
126	FORT YUKON	637	0.14%	\$44,189	0.21%	\$56,251	0.18%
127	FORTUNA LEDGE	263	0.05%	\$17,169	0.08%	\$30,778	0.09%
128	GAMBELL	447	0.10%	\$18,779	0.09%	\$31,031	0.10%
129	GOLDOVIN	118	0.02%	\$6,734	0.03%	\$28,928	0.09%
130	GOODNEWS BAY	248	0.05%	\$0	0.00%	\$28,305	0.09%
131	GRAYLING	181	0.04%	\$7,465	0.03%	\$30,403	0.09%
132	HOLY CROSS	302	0.06%	\$14,457	0.07%	\$31,365	0.10%
133	HOOPER BAY	610	0.13%	\$10,133	0.05%	\$28,305	0.09%
134	HONSTON	440	0.09%	\$34,179	0.16%	\$65,657	0.21%
135	HUGHES	98	0.02%	\$1,231	0.00%	\$29,121	0.09%
136	HUSLIA	212	0.04%	\$33,912	0.16%	\$64,169	0.20%
137	KACHEMAK	151	0.03%	\$0	0.00%	\$23,406	0.07%
138	KAKTOVIK	192	0.04%	\$2,413	0.01%	\$29,121	0.09%
139	KALTAG	257	0.05%	\$6,763	0.03%	\$29,927	0.09%
140	KASAAK	46	0.01%	\$3,439	0.01%	\$22,252	0.07%
141	KIANA	344	0.07%	\$17,741	0.08%	\$30,972	0.09%

143 KOBUK	91	0.014	\$11,397	0.052	\$21,365	0.102
144 KOTLIK	305	0.062	18,375	0.042	128,928	0.092
145 KOTZEBUE	2,526	0.562	\$111,653	0.552	\$138,276	0.442
146 KOYUK	178	0.042	\$3,035	0.042	\$29,158	0.092
147 KOYUKUK	124	0.022	\$4,356	0.022	\$29,762	0.092
148 KUPREANOF	42	0.002	\$474	0.002	\$12,589	0.072
149 KWETHLUK	444	0.092	\$14,533	0.072	\$28,928	0.092
150 LARSEN BAY	133	0.022	\$1,313	0.002	\$23,406	0.072
151 LOWER KALSKAG	229	0.052	\$50,240	0.242	\$93,421	0.302
152 MANKHOTAK	250	0.052	\$8,897	0.042	\$28,093	0.092
153 MCGRATHI	322	0.082	\$25,948	0.122	\$32,883	0.102
154 MEKORYUK	174	0.032	\$8,074	0.032	\$28,928	0.092
155 MURHAYN VILLAGE	543	0.122	\$38,933	0.192	\$51,197	0.162
156 NAPAHTAK	313	0.072	\$15,038	0.072	\$29,894	0.092
157 NAPAHTAK	240	0.052	\$9,928	0.042	\$29,048	0.092
158 NEWHALEN	105	0.022	\$0	0.002	\$27,488	0.082
159 NEW STUYANUK	297	0.062	\$9,151	0.042	\$28,093	0.092
160 NEWTUK	154	0.032	\$7,596	0.032	\$28,928	0.092
161 NIGHMULE	135	0.032	\$3,048	0.012	\$28,694	0.092
162 NIKULAI	152	0.032	\$0	0.002	\$29,121	0.092
163 NODVALTIN	226	0.052	\$0	0.002	\$27,488	0.082
164 NODVYK	526	0.112	\$17,332	0.082	\$30,003	0.092
165 NULATU	332	0.072	\$14,377	0.072	\$31,405	0.102
166 NUIGASUT	182	0.042	\$0	0.002	\$29,121	0.092
167 OLD HARBOR	345	0.072	\$14,176	0.072	\$24,839	0.082
168 OUZINKI	177	0.032	\$2,922	0.012	\$23,631	0.072
169 PILOT STATION	301	0.062	\$10,727	0.052	\$23,084	0.092
170 PLATTINUM	58	0.012	\$20,298	0.102	\$41,537	0.132
171 POINT HOME	464	0.102	\$0	0.002	\$29,121	0.092
172 PORT ALEXANDER	101	0.022	\$985	0.002	\$22,589	0.072
173 PORT HEIDEN	91	0.022	\$42,311	0.202	\$88,183	0.282
174 PORT LIONS	232	0.052	\$8,863	0.042	\$24,192	0.072
175 QUTINAGAK	448	0.102	\$14,278	0.072	\$29,415	0.092
176 PUBBY	220	0.042	\$2,764	0.012	\$29,121	0.092
177 RUSSIAN MISSION	167	0.032	\$0	0.002	\$28,305	0.092
178 SAINT MICHAEL	282	0.062	\$10,660	0.052	\$28,928	0.092
179 SAINT PAUL	567	0.122	\$67,644	0.332	\$117,264	0.372
180 SAVIDOKKA	409	0.092	\$13,701	0.062	\$28,928	0.092
181 SAXMAN	272	0.062	\$6,234	0.032	\$28,928	0.092
182 SCANDINAVIAN BAY	232	0.052	\$11,749	0.052	\$29,415	0.092
183 SELAWIK	505	0.112	\$9,901	0.042	\$29,121	0.092
184 SHAGELUK	223	0.052	\$0	0.002	\$29,121	0.092
185 SHAKTODLIK	160	0.032	\$28,232	0.132	\$51,197	0.162
186 SHELDON POINT	143	0.032	\$0	0.002	\$28,305	0.092
187 SHEWANEF	373	0.082	\$15,742	0.072	\$29,699	0.092
188 SHIRCHAK	198	0.042	\$7,804	0.032	\$29,762	0.092
189 STELLINS	309	0.062	\$11,307	0.052	\$28,928	0.092
190 TANANA	499	0.112	\$25,194	0.122	\$36,606	0.112
191 TELLER	258	0.052	\$12,414	0.052	\$29,975	0.092
192 TENAKEE SPRINGS	141	0.032	\$4,414	0.022	\$22,900	0.072
193 TUGTAK	474	0.102	\$15,665	0.072	\$29,379	0.092
194 TOKSOOK BAY	336	0.072	\$12,610	0.062	\$28,928	0.092
195 TULIKSAK	258	0.052	\$30,314	0.142	\$49,587	0.152
196 TULUKANAK	299	0.062	\$11,068	0.052	\$28,928	0.092
197 UNYANAK EET	632	0.142	\$33,791	0.162	\$41,848	0.132
198 UPPER KALSKAG	166	0.032	\$3,974	0.012	\$29,121	0.092
199 WAIKWAIGIT	429	0.092	\$0	0.002	\$29,121	0.092
200 WALES	130	0.022	\$0	0.002	\$27,488	0.082
201 WASTILLA	2,184	0.492	\$51,614	0.252	\$113,377	0.362
202 W. JE MOUNTAIN	115	0.022	\$0	0.002	\$27,488	0.082
203 WHITTIER	292	0.062	\$25,025	0.122	\$34,465	0.112
204 DEENING	193	0.022	\$7,298	0.032	\$29,762	0.092
205 EXT FIRE AREAS	1	0.002	\$52,204	0.252	\$68,803	0.222
TOTAL			\$20,311,591		\$31,000,000	

HOUSE RESEARCH AGENCY
Pouch Y - State Capitol
Juneau, Alaska 99811
465-3991

MEMORANDUM

March 26, 1980

TO: Representative Terry Gardiner

FROM: Jack Kreinheder, Issues Analyst *JK*

RE: Explanation of HB 192 Equalization Formula
Research Request No. 64

You have requested that I prepare for the Finance Committee some practical examples of how the equalization formula in Chapter 88 of HB 192 is applied. This memorandum presents three hypothetical and three real applications of the equalization formula. Also included in the last section is a revised estimate of the taxation incentive under HB 192.

The HB 192 equalization formula is defined as $P \times R$, where P = population and R = millage rate equivalent, or local tax effort. This local effort factor is calculated by dividing the total locally generated revenues allowed under the bill by one-tenth of one percent of the total property value of the taxing unit. To take a theoretical case, if a municipality has local revenues of \$1 million and a total property valuation of \$100 million, the local effort factor would be 10 [$\$1 \text{ million} / (\$100 \text{ million} \times .001)$]. A municipality with the same tax base but \$2 million in local revenues would have a local effort factor of 20 [$\$2 \text{ million} / (\$1 \text{ million} \times .001)$], and its Chapter 88 entitlement per resident would therefore be twice that of the former community.

A third example would be a municipality with the same local revenues as the first example (\$1 million), but with a tax base only half as large (\$50 million). This municipality would also have a local effort factor of 20 [$\$1 \text{ million} / (\$50 \text{ million} \times .001)$], and would therefore receive twice the Chapter 88 entitlement per resident of the first example, and the same entitlement as the second example. Although the municipality in the second example raises twice the local revenues of the municipality in the third case, the second municipality's tax base is also twice as large; thus, the tax burden and local effort factor of the two municipalities is identical and they would receive the same entitlement per resident under Chapter 88. Of course, if the populations of the two municipalities differed, the actual Chapter 88 entitlement for each of the two local governments would vary in direct proportion to their populations. Table 1 summarizes the three examples presented above.

Representative Terry Gardiner
March 26, 1980
Page 2

To further illustrate the relationship of the three variables used in the equalization formula--population, local revenues, and local assessed property valuation--consider the communities of Kenai, Ketchikan, and Homer. Table II shows how the equalization entitlement is calculated for each of the communities. As the table indicates, the local revenues generated by Kenai are only about 72 percent as large as those raised by Ketchikan, but Kenai's property valuation is also about 72 percent that of Ketchikan's; therefore, the local effort factors are nearly identical (19.95 vs. 19.50). These cities are placing similar tax burdens on their residents and their equalization entitlements per resident would thus be comparable. Ketchikan has nearly twice as many residents as Kenai, and its total Chapter 88 entitlement would be correspondingly greater than Kenai's.

Homer has a tax base of about \$86 million, or about 64 percent of Kenai's. If the local revenues raised by Homer were also 64 percent of the local revenues collected by Kenai, the local effort factors and Chapter 88 entitlements per resident of the two cities would be identical. However, Homer's actual locally-generated revenues are only about 30 percent as large as Kenai's. Homer's local effort factor would therefore be less than half that of Kenai's (9.17 vs. 19.95). In other words, the tax burden on the residents of Kenai, relative to the tax base of the community, is more than twice the tax burden carried by Homer residents. Kenai's equalization entitlement under HB 192 would therefore be about 2.2 times more per resident than Homer's. It should be noted that although Homer's Chapter 88 entitlement per resident would be less than either Ketchikan's or Kenai's, Homer would still receive more revenue sharing funds than it currently receives at any HB 192 total entitlement of \$27 million or greater (including health entitlements).

One additional consideration should be mentioned. There is a fourth factor used in determining equalization entitlements under HB 192 however, it is applied equally to all communities. This is a proration factor which calculates the share of the total entitlement which is distributed under the equalization entitlement provision (Chapter 88). The proration factor varies according to the total entitlement; at a total entitlement of \$27 million (including health entitlements), the factor is about 2.4. The actual equalization entitlement for each local government at a total entitlement of \$27 million would therefore be 2.4 times the amount determined by application of the equalization formula.

HB 192 Taxation Incentive

The incentive for municipalities to raise tax rates in order to receive additional revenue sharing funds under HB 192 is much smaller than I indicated to you at the Finance Committee meeting of 3/24. I had thought that the local taxes/revenue sharing entitlement ratio was about 3 to 1; i.e., three additional dollars in local taxes would increase the revenue

Representative Terry Gardiner

March 26, 1980

Page 3

sharing entitlement by one dollar. However, test runs of the computer model indicate that this 3:1 ration applies only to very small communities or service areas, and that the ratio is much higher for larger municipalities. Anchorage appears to have the highest ratio at about 23 to 1, meaning that to obtain one additional revenue sharing dollar under HB 192, Anchorage would have to raise an additional \$23 in local taxes. The average ratio for all the municipalities appears to be about 14 to 1. Therefore, the incentive for municipalities to raise taxes under HB 192 is much lower than previously indicated.

JK/dp

TABLE I
 THREE EXAMPLES OF THE HB 192
 EQUALIZATION FORMULA

	<u>LOCALLY-GENERATED REVENUES</u>		<u>PROPERTY VALUATION</u>		<u>LOCAL EFFORT FACTOR (millage rate equivalent)</u>
MUNICIPALITY 1	\$1 million	÷	[\$100 million (x .001)]	=	10
MUNICIPALITY 2	\$2 million	÷	[\$100 million (x .001)]	=	20
MUNICIPALITY 3	\$1 million	÷	[\$ 50 million (x .001)]	=	20

Prepared by:
 House Research Agency
 March 25, 1980

TABLE II
 THE HB 192 EQUALIZATION FORMULA
 AS
 APPLIED TO THREE ALASKAN CITIES
 (Thousands of Dollars)

	<u>LOCALLY-GENERATED REVENUES</u>		<u>PROPERTY VALUATION</u>		<u>LOCAL EFFORT FACTOR</u>		<u>POPULATION</u>		<u>EQUALIZATION ENTITLEMENT (CHAPTER 88)</u>
KETCHIKAN	\$3,715	÷	[\$190,000 (x .001)]	=	19.50	(x)	8,542	(x 2.4)* =	\$401
KENAI	2,667	÷	[\$134,000 (x .001)]	=	19.95	(x)	4,421	(x 2.4) =	\$212
HOMER	789	÷	[\$ 86,000 (x .001)]	=	9.17	(x)	2,227	(x 2.4) =	\$ 49

* 2.4 is the equalization entitlement proration factor at a total entitlement of \$27 million. The factor will vary in accordance with the total entitlement level, as explained in the attached memo.

Prepared by:

House Research Agency
 March 25, 1980

HOUSE RESEARCH AGENCY
Pouch Y - State Capitol
Juneau, Alaska 99811
465-3991

MEMORANDUM

April 9, 1980

TO: Representative Bill Parker
Senator Arliss Sturgulewski

FROM: Jack Kreinheder, Issues Analyst *JK*

RE: Incentives for Regional Government Formation
and Local Service Delivery
Research Request No. 8

In a meeting on March 21 with Marjorie Gorsuch and Margo Waring of your staffs, it was agreed that the best course of action at this point would be for me to focus my research efforts on the development of specific amendments to HB 192 which would enable the bill to more effectively meet some of your goals for the revenue sharing program. The two objectives chosen for further study were: (1) to provide greater incentives for the formation of regional governments in the unorganized borough; and (2) to provide incentives for the transfer of service delivery responsibility to the local level.

It appears that the potential for modifying the HB 192 revenue sharing proposal to meet these objectives without sacrificing the political viability of the bill is rather limited, for reasons explained below. However, we have formulated two possible amendments to the bill which would provide the types of incentives you wish to create. The two proposals are described below.

Borough Formation Incentives

Under AS 29.18.180, a newly incorporated borough is eligible for an organizational grant of at least \$25,000, or \$10 for every voter participating in the borough incorporation election. It is widely recognized that a grant of this size would cover only a small part of the organizational costs of any new borough. The State Assessor's Office has estimated that it would cost at least \$200,000 just to prepare the initial tax assessment roll in any one of the current R.E.A.A.'s. New boroughs would also be faced with the cost of hiring municipal personnel, establishing new services, and other major expenses. In addition, the organizational grant amount has not been changed since 1966, although inflation has more than doubled costs since that time.

One way to encourage borough formation would therefore be to amend AS 29.18.180 to provide a larger grant. A minimum organizational grant for new boroughs of \$125,000 per year for the first two years, and \$75,000 for the third year, would more accurately reflect the true costs of organization and would provide a greater incentive for the formation of regional governments in the unorganized borough. These figures were developed by staff members of the Department of Community and Regional Affairs and suggested to me by Patrick Poland of the Department's Local Government Assistance Division.

Although these grant values may still not cover all the costs of borough organization, depending on the size and situation of the area being organized, they would at least provide a more realistic and substantial amount of funding for this purpose. Of course, increasing the organizational grants to even higher levels would offer a greater incentive for borough formation, but there would appear to be a clear trade-off between the amount of funding offered and the prospects of the legislation being enacted.

It would probably be desirable to retain the per capita provision of the organizational grants to account for the higher costs of organizing boroughs for larger or more populated areas. Under present law, a new borough would receive more on a per capita basis than the minimum grant if more than 2500 persons vote in the organization election. Applying the same 2500 voter threshold to the proposed total organizational grant of \$325,000, the per voter grant would be \$130.

It may also be desirable to incorporate other factors into the organizational grants, such as land area of the new borough, population density, or taxable property value. Unfortunately, little is known about the quantitative relationship between these factors and the cost of borough organization, and making the organizational grant provisions too complex could reduce the incentive for organization which the grant is intended to provide.

Incentives for Local Service Delivery

The services which were identified during this research as possible candidates for the transferral of delivery responsibility from the state to the local level are police protection and the maintenance of airports, ports and harbors, and certain types of roads. A number of local governments have expressed interest in assuming these services, but could not

obtain sufficient funding from their own resources or from the current revenue sharing program. A possible method of encouraging local governments to assume responsibility for police services and the maintenance of transportation facilities would be to allow municipalities to receive the funds which the State would otherwise expend in providing the particular service the municipality wished to assume.

For example, if the Department of Public Safety spends \$50,000 per year to provide police assistance to a given community, that community could elect to receive the \$50,000 directly in exchange for an agreement to provide a similar level of police protection. If the community felt it could not fully replace the services of the State Troopers, but wanted to have some type of police assistance at the community level, the local government could receive a level of funding which corresponded to the expected reduction in State Trooper expenditures resulting from the local police service plan. For example, if the majority of police assistance calls in a community were for relatively minor late-night or weekend disturbances, the community could receive some funding for a part-time or on-call local officer, while retaining the services of the State Troopers for homicides or other serious crimes. A similar arrangement could apply to the maintenance of airports, harbors, and roads.

It appears that this type of approach would need to be carried out through negotiations between the Department of Public Safety - or the Department of Transportation, in the case of airports, harbors, and roads - and local governments on an individual basis. The primary concern of the departments involved would probably be to ensure that their responsibilities for local services would be decreased in proportion to their loss in funding. It might be desirable for local governments to prepare a plan of service which would demonstrate to the department's satisfaction that the municipality would be able to either meet the same standards as the service provided by the department, or, if it provided a lower level of service, would require only part of the department's funding for that service.

The primary advantage of transferring these types of services to the local level would be enhanced flexibility and freedom of choice for municipalities with regard to the types and levels of service provided in each community. Local governments assuming a service previously provided by the State would be free to supplement the State funding with other local, federal, or State monies if they wished to provide a greater level of service. Although it is questionable whether local governments should be allowed to use the State money for an altogether different

service than the one being transferred, since police protection and basic facility maintenance are usually considered as essential services, municipalities could be allowed to provide the service in an alternative manner that fulfilled the same needs, but was more appropriate for the particular characteristics and situation of each community. For example, a community with high unemployment could elect to employ maintenance procedures for its airport, harbor, or roads which made less use of graders, dredges and other equipment, and employed more workers instead.

There are a number of potential difficulties with the local assumption of State services. Economies of scale appear to be one of the most significant problems with this approach. Particularly in the smaller communities, it may not be economically feasible to maintain a police force or maintenance personnel at the local level. A related problem is that of administrative support for police and maintenance services. Although a community might be able to afford a policeman's salary, for example, it may not be able to cover the cost of equipment, insurance, legal protection, and other necessary administrative expenses. However, it may be possible for two or more local governments in close proximity to enter into joint agreements for a particular service, and thereby increase the efficiency and feasibility of the service, while still retaining local control.

An additional problem may be that in some cases the department's costs would not be significantly reduced if a local government assumed a particular service. For instance, the Department of Public Safety may have one State Trooper who is responsible for a region containing five small communities. If two of these communities decide to assume responsibility for police protection, the Department would probably save only the cost of transporting the trooper to those communities, because it can't employ three-fifths of a trooper for the remaining communities.

One practical consideration with the transfer of services to the local level is that the departments may not be able to break out their expenditures on a community-by-community basis. Should this problem arise, one solution would be to require such a breakdown for the upcoming fiscal year and then implement the transfer of service responsibility the following year.

A final problem could be that of differing standards of service quality between the departments and the communities assuming new services. Because judgements about levels and qualities of service tend to be subjective in nature, it is easy to imagine disputes arising between the departments and local governments about whether a municipality's approach to service delivery

met the same standards as the service previously provided by the State.

HB 192 Issues

Neither of the options discussed above would directly modify the revenue sharing program proposed in HB 192, although the options could be incorporated in the bill as a separate section. We considered several possible changes to the HB 192 revenue sharing proposal which would provide incentives for borough formation and local assumption of services, but it was evident that none of these changes could be made without seriously compromising the political viability of the bill. The basic problem is that any changes to the HB 192 equalization formula or other parts of the bill which would provide these types of incentives will result in a loss of revenue sharing funds for established municipalities, or will reduce local flexibility in the use of revenue sharing funds. Both of these results would tend to reduce the support of existing municipalities for the bill, which is already facing an uncertain political future.

The Municipality of Anchorage currently opposes the passage of HB 192. Anchorage municipal officials are concerned that even though Anchorage would receive an increase in revenue sharing funds under HB 192, the municipality's percentage share of the total revenue sharing entitlement would decrease. The significance of this point for this discussion is that any changes to the HB 192 revenue sharing proposal which would provide the types of incentives you desire, would further reduce Anchorage's share (together with all existing local governments' shares) of the total funding for the program. Such changes could therefore further jeopardize the passage of HB 192 by increasing the opposition of Anchorage officials and possibly diminishing the support of other local governments for the bill.

The two major changes we considered and rejected were: (1) providing a temporarily increased entitlement to new boroughs; and (2) requiring that revenue sharing funds be used for the provision of local services, rather than capital improvements or general government expenses. Under the first approach, the equalization entitlement and/or the minimum entitlement for new boroughs would be increased by a specified factor, say three or four times, in the first year and then tapered off over several years. This increased funding would serve a purpose similar to the organizational grants suggested earlier in this memorandum; the major distinction between the two approaches is that the increased revenue sharing entitlement for the new boroughs would necessarily reduce the entitlements for all other local governments, while the

organizational grants could be funded separately, as they are under present law, and would not affect the dollar allocation or percentage share of other local governments.

With regard to incentives for local assumption of service delivery responsibilities, it was noted in my earlier memorandum of February 15 that HB 192 does increase such incentives over the present revenue sharing program by increasing the total funding level and by allowing municipalities to allocate revenue sharing funds according to local priorities. Because HB 192 would not require revenue sharing funds to be spent for local services, as opposed to capital improvements or other expenses, consideration was given to including such a requirement in the bill. However, my conversations with Community and Regional Affairs staff, Jack Chenoweth, and others indicated that many municipalities would be strongly opposed to such a requirement. In addition, a requirement of that type runs contrary to the HB 192 emphasis on local flexibility.

An important additional point is that the two options proposed earlier in this memorandum are not intended to represent a comprehensive approach to the formation of regional governments and the local provision of services. The local government legislation package already introduced would provide greater incentives in these areas than any politically feasible additions to HB 192. However, given the constraints established by the HB 192 approach to revenue sharing, these two options appear to be the most viable means of adding the types of incentives you desire to HB 192.

We hope our comments are useful. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you would like to discuss this subject in more detail, or if we may be of further assistance.

JK/bf

HOUSE RESEARCH AGENCY
Pouch Y - State Capitol
Juneau, Alaska 99811
465-3991

MEMORANDUM

TO: Representative Bill Parker
Senator Arliss Sturgulewski

FROM: Jack Kreinheder, Issues Analyst *JK*

RE: Incentives for Regional Government Formation
and Local Service Delivery
Research Request No. 8

In a meeting on March 21 with Marjorie Gorsuch and Margo Waring of your staffs, it was agreed that the best course of action at this point would be for me to focus my research efforts on the development of specific amendments to HB 192 which would enable the bill to more effectively meet some of your goals for the revenue sharing program. The two objectives chosen for further study were: (1) to provide greater incentives for the formation of regional governments in the unorganized borough; and (2) to provide incentives for the transfer of service delivery responsibility to the local level.

It appears that the potential for modifying the HB 192 revenue sharing proposal to meet these objectives without sacrificing the political viability of the bill is rather limited, for reasons explained below. However, we have formulated two possible amendments to the bill which would provide the types of incentives you wish to create. The two proposals are described below.

Borough Formation Incentives

Under AS 29.18.180, a newly incorporated borough is eligible for an organizational grant of at least \$25,000, or \$10 for every voter participating in the borough incorporation election. It is widely recognized that a grant of this size would cover only a small part of of the organizational costs of any new borough. The State Assessor's Office has estimated that it would cost at least \$200,000 just to prepare the initial tax assessment roll in any one of the current R.E.A.A.'s. New boroughs would also be faced with the cost of hiring municipal personnel, establishing new services, and other major expenses. In addition, the organizational grant amount has not been changed since 1968, although inflation has more than doubled costs since that time.

One way to encourage borough formation would therefore be to amend AS 29.18.180 to provide a larger grant. A minimum organizational grant for new boroughs of \$125,000 per year for the first two years, and \$75,000 for the third year, would more accurately reflect the true costs of organization and would provide a greater incentive for the formation of regional governments in the unorganized borough. These figures were developed by staff members of the Department of Community and Regional Affairs and suggested to me by Patrick Poland of the Department's Local Government Assistance Division.

Although these grant values may still not cover all the costs of borough organization, depending on the size and situation of the area being organized, they would at least provide a more realistic and substantial amount of funding for this purpose. Of course, increasing the organizational grants to even higher levels would offer a greater incentive for borough formation, but there would appear to be a clear trade-off between the amount of funding offered and the prospects of the legislation being enacted.

It would probably be desirable to retain the per capita provision of the organizational grants to account for the higher costs of organizing boroughs for larger or more populated areas. Under present law, a new borough would receive more on a per capita basis than the minimum grant if more than 2500 persons vote in the organization election. Applying the same 2500 voter threshold to the proposed total organizational grant of \$325,000, the per voter grant would be \$130.

It may also be desirable to incorporate other factors into the organizational grants, such as land area of the new borough, population density, or taxable property value. Unfortunately, little is known about the quantitative relationship between these factors and the cost of borough organization, and making the organizational grant provisions too complex could reduce the incentive for organization which the grant is intended to provide.

Incentives for Local Service Delivery

The services which were identified during this research as possible candidates for the transferral of delivery responsibility from the state to the local level are police protection and the maintenance of airports, ports and harbors, and certain types of roads. A number of local governments have expressed interest in assuming these services, but could not

obtain sufficient funding from their own resources or from the current revenue sharing program. A possible method of encouraging local governments to assume responsibility for police services and the maintenance of transportation facilities would be to allow municipalities to receive the funds which the State would otherwise expend in providing the particular service the municipality wished to assume.

For example, if the Department of Public Safety spends \$50,000 per year to provide police assistance to a given community, that community could elect to receive the \$50,000 directly in exchange for an agreement to provide a similar level of police protection. If the community felt it could not fully replace the services of the State Troopers, but wanted to have some type of police assistance at the community level, the local government could receive a level of funding which corresponded to the expected reduction in State Trooper expenditures resulting from the local police service plan. For example, if the majority of police assistance calls in a community were for relatively minor late-night or weekend disturbances, the community could receive some funding for a part-time or on-call local officer, while retaining the services of the State Troopers for homicides or other serious crimes. A similar arrangement could apply to the maintenance of airports, harbors, and roads.

It appears that this type of approach would need to be carried out through negotiations between the Department of Public Safety - or the Department of Transportation, in the case of airports, harbors, and roads - and local governments on an individual basis. The primary concern of the departments involved would probably be to ensure that their responsibilities for local services would be decreased in proportion to their loss in funding. It might be desirable for local governments to prepare a plan of service which would demonstrate to the department's satisfaction that the municipality would be able to either meet the same standards as the service provided by the department, or, if it provided a lower level of service, would require only part of the department's funding for that service.

The primary advantage of transferring these types of services to the local level would be enhanced flexibility and freedom of choice for municipalities with regard to the types and levels of service provided in each community. Local governments assuming a service previously provided by the State would be free to supplement the State funding with other local, federal, or State monies if they wished to provide a greater level of service. Although it is questionable whether local governments should be allowed to use the State money for an altogether different

service than the one being transferred, since police protection and basic facility maintenance are usually considered as essential services, municipalities could be allowed to provide the service in an alternative manner that fulfilled the same needs, but was more appropriate for the particular characteristics and situation of each community. For example, a community with high unemployment could elect to employ maintenance procedures for its airport, harbor, or roads which made less use of graders, dredges and other equipment, and employed more workers instead.

There are a number of potential difficulties with the local assumption of State services. Economies of scale appear to be one of the most significant problems with this approach. Particularly in the smaller communities, it may not be economically feasible to maintain a police force or maintenance personnel at the local level. A related problem is that of administrative support for police and maintenance services. Although a community might be able to afford a policeman's salary, for example, it may not be able to cover the cost of equipment, insurance, legal protection, and other necessary administrative expenses. However, it may be possible for two or more local governments in close proximity to enter into joint agreements for a particular service, and thereby increase the efficiency and feasibility of the service, while still retaining local control.

An additional problem may be that in some cases the department's costs would not be significantly reduced if a local government assumed a particular service. For instance, the Department of Public Safety may have one State Trooper who is responsible for a region containing five small communities. If two of these communities decide to assume responsibility for police protection, the Department would probably save only the cost of transporting the trooper to those communities, because it can't employ three-fifths of a trooper for the remaining communities.

One practical consideration with the transfer of services to the local level is that the departments may not be able to break out their expenditures on a community-by-community basis. Should this problem arise, one solution would be to require such a breakdown for the upcoming fiscal year and then implement the transfer of service responsibility the following year.

A final problem could be that of differing standards of service quality between the departments and the communities assuming new services. Because judgements about levels and qualities of service tend to be subjective in nature, it is easy to imagine disputes arising between the departments and local governments about whether a municipality's approach to service delivery

met the same standards as the service previously provided by the State.

HB 192 Issues

Neither of the options discussed above would directly modify the revenue sharing program proposed in HB 192, although the options could be incorporated in the bill as a separate section. We considered several possible changes to the HB 192 revenue sharing proposal which would provide incentives for borough formation and local assumption of services, but it was evident that none of these changes could be made without seriously compromising the political viability of the bill. The basic problem is that any changes to the HB 192 equalization formula or other parts of the bill which would provide these types of incentives will result in a loss of revenue sharing funds for established municipalities, or will reduce local flexibility in the use of revenue sharing funds. Both of these results would tend to reduce the support of existing municipalities for the bill, which is already facing an uncertain political future.

The Municipality of Anchorage currently opposes the passage of HB 192. Anchorage municipal officials are concerned that even though Anchorage would receive an increase in revenue sharing funds under HB 192, the municipality's percentage share of the total revenue sharing entitlement would decrease. The significance of this point for this discussion is that any changes to the HB 192 revenue sharing proposal which would provide the types of incentives you desire, would further reduce Anchorage's share (together with all existing local governments' shares) of the total funding for the program. Such changes could therefore further jeopardize the passage of HB 192 by increasing the opposition of Anchorage officials and possibly diminishing the support of other local governments for the bill.

The two major changes we considered and rejected were: (1) providing a temporarily increased entitlement to new boroughs; and (2) requiring that revenue sharing funds be used for the provision of local services, rather than capital improvements or general government expenses. Under the first approach, the equalization entitlement and/or the minimum entitlement for new boroughs would be increased by a specified factor, say three or four times, in the first year and then tapered off over several years. This increased funding would serve a purpose similar to the organizational grants suggested earlier in this memorandum; the major distinction between the two approaches is that the increased revenue sharing entitlement for the new boroughs would necessarily reduce the entitlements for all other local governments, while the

Representative Bill Parker
Senator Arliss Sturgulewski
Page No. 6

organizational grants could be funded separately, as they are under present law, and would not affect the dollar allocation or percentage share of other local governments.

With regard to incentives for local assumption of service delivery responsibilities, it was noted in my earlier memorandum of February 15 that HB 192 does increase such incentives over the present revenue sharing program by increasing the total funding level and by allowing municipalities to allocate revenue sharing funds according to local priorities. Because HB 192 would not require revenue sharing funds to be spent for local services, as opposed to capital improvements or other expenses, consideration was given to including such a requirement in the bill. However, my conversations with Community and Regional Affairs staff, Jack Chenoweth, and others indicated that many municipalities would be strongly opposed to such a requirement. In addition, a requirement of that type runs contrary to the HB 192 emphasis on local flexibility.

An important additional point is that the two options proposed earlier in this memorandum are not intended to represent a comprehensive approach to the formation of regional governments and the local provision of services. The local government legislation package already introduced would provide greater incentives in these areas than any politically feasible additions to HB 192. However, given the constraints established by the HB 192 approach to revenue sharing, these two options appear to be the most viable means of adding the types of incentives you desire to HB 192.

We hope our comments are useful. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you would like to discuss this subject in more detail, or if we may be of further assistance.

JK/bf

May 5, 1980

TO: Gary Peska, Senate Finance

FROM: Margo Waring, Staff
Senator Sturgulewski's Office

RE: SCS CS HB 192

I am forwarding to you copies of materials supplied to the Senate Community and Regional Affairs Committee for our hearings on HB 192. You may find these helpful in your and the Senate Finance Committee's review of the legislation.

I also thought I would summarize for you the CRA Committee's actions on this bill. Amendments adopted by the Senate CRA Committee dealt with several different areas:

1. revision to the Volunteer Fire Department eligibility
2. changes regarding eligible utility revenues and assessments for public utilities
3. two highly important revenue sharing studies for baseline information on mass transit and hospital costs
4. separation of hospital construction funding from the miscellaneous services account
5. adoption of the Anchorage Municipality's amendment to increase the allocation for six communities and to peg future sums to a population figure - There was a great deal of debate on this amendment, leading to a split decision. The other version favored by Committee members, including the Chairman, was an amendment offered by the Alaska Municipal League which would "hold harmless" for five years at 115% of full entitlement. This would favorably impact more communities, while achieving Anchorage's goal of increasing their percentage of revenue sharing. It is also an approach consistent with the approach of the bill itself.

I would be glad to provide any additional background information you might wish. We have requested additional computer runs for our amendments from Jack Krieheder of House Research. These runs are not yet complete, so I have asked him to contact you directly.

Enclosure

T for year file

SENATE AMENDMENT

BY Senator Rodey, Senator Kelly, Senator Meland,
Senator Sturgulewski, Senator Dankworth,
~~Senator Stimson, Senator Sumner, Senator Bradley~~
Senator Hackney, Senator Bennett & Senator Fahrenkam

To: _____ SENATE BILL No. _____
To: _____ SCS CS _____ HOUSE BILL No. 192 (Finance)

PAGE: 19 LINE: 5

Page 19 - Delete lines 5 through 11 and insert in their places a new section to read:

Section 13 to read:

AS 29.95.030 is amended by adding a new section to read:

Sec. 29.95.030. ENTITLEMENT ADJUSTMENT. (a) A municipality may not receive a total amount of money under AS 29.88, AS 29.89, and AS 29.95.020 which is less in proportion to the total amount appropriated and allocated under those sections than 90 percent of the percentage of the population of the municipality to the total population of the state for the fiscal year, as the population of the municipality and the population of all municipalities of the state is determined under AS 29.88.015.

(b) When the total amount that would be received by a municipality under AS 29.88, AS 29.89 and AS 29.95.020 is less than the amount determined under (a) of this section, the department shall pay to the municipality, in addition to payments under AS 29.88, AS 29.89, and AS 29.95.020, the amount of the difference.

(c) For purposes of determining whether an entitlement adjustment is payable to a borough under this section, if a borough includes one or more cities which are entitled to receive entitlements payable under AS 29.88, AS 29.89 or AS 29.95.020, in addition to the entitlement of the borough, entitlements payable to the cities shall be considered as if they were payable to the borough.

(d) The minimum entitlement adjustment account is established. Money to carry out the provisions of this section shall be allocated by the department to the account in accordance with AS 29.95.010. If amounts in the account are insufficient to pay each municipality's share authorized under this section, the amounts which are available shall be distributed pro rata among eligible municipalities.

ESTIMATE OF ADDITIONAL FUNDING REQUIRED FOR
AMENDMENT TO STATE REVENUE SHARING BILL

<u>Borough/City</u>	<u>Population</u>	<u>% of State Population</u> ^(a)	<u>90% of Previous Column</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>% of State Total</u>	<u>Additional Requirement</u>
Anchorage	204,809	46.08%	41.47%	\$8,190,667	36.02%	\$1,239,376
Sitka	8,787	1.98%	1.78%	254,978	1.12%	150,090
Galena	957	0.22%	0.20%	33,844	0.15%	11,370
Kake	710	0.16%	0.14%	26,350	0.12%	4,548
Delta Junction	892	0.20%	0.18%	28,197	0.12%	13,645
Valdez	4,066	0.91%	0.82%	136,868	0.60%	<u>50,030</u>
						<u>\$1,469,059</u>

(a) State population data as of July 1, 1979 (441,481 total state population)

THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA
ELEVENTH LEGISLATURE

FISCAL NOTE

I. REQUEST
 Bill/Resolution No. CSHB 192 (Finance)
 Title Equalization of the Tax Resources of Municipalities
 Requested by House Finance Date 4/22/80

II. FISCAL DETAIL
 Agency Affected Community & Regional Affairs
 Program Category Affected Community Development
 BRU, Program, or Subprogram(s) Affected Local Government Assistance - Grants
 (Note: If more than one budget component is affected, separate line-item amounts and funding for each component in the analysis section.)
EXPENDITURES (Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 80	FY 81	FY 82	FY 83	FY 84	FY 85
100 PERSONAL SERVICES .						
200 TRAVEL						
300 CONTRACTUAL						
400 COMMODITIES						
500 EQUIPMENT						
600 LAND & STRUCTURES						
700 GRANTS, CLAIMS, ETC.		4,435.0				
TOTAL		4,435.0				

FUNDING (Thousands of Dollars)

GENERAL FUN.	4,435.0				
FEDERAL FUNDS					
OTHER (Specify Fund Source)					

POSITIONS

FULL TIME					
PART TIME					
TEMPORARY					

III. ANALYSIS (See Fiscal Note Preparation Instructions, Section III)

Sec. 12 of CSHB 192 (Finance) provides for the bill becoming effective when \$31.0 million is appropriated for a fiscal year.

The Governor's and House's version of the general appropriations act, HB 556, already contains \$26,565,000 for revenue sharing.

IV. DATE 4/22/80 PREPARED BY Milt Barker
 AGENCY Legislative Finance Div.
 PHONE 465-3795
 Original: Legislative Finance
 cc: Budget and Management
 Prime Sponsor (First Legislator Named)

THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA
TENTH LEGISLATURE

FISCAL NOTE

I. REQUEST

Bill/Resolution No. CS HB 192
Title Equalization of the tax resources of municipalities (municipal revenue sharing)
Requested by _____ Date _____

II. FISCAL DETAIL

Agency Affected Community & Regional Affairs
Program Category Affected Community Development
Budget Request Unit(s) Affected Local Government Assistance - Grants

EXPENDITURES (Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 78	FY 79	FY 80	FY 81	FY 82	FY 83
100 PERSONAL SERVICES						
200 TRAVEL						
300 CONTRACTUAL						
400 COMMODITIES						
500 EQUIPMENT						
600 LAND & STRUCTURES						
700 GRANTS, CLAIMS, ETC.						
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0

FUNDING (Thousands of Dollars)

GENERAL FUND						
FEDERAL FUNDS						
OTHER (Specify)						

POSITIONS

FULL TIME						
PART TIME						
TEMPORARY						

III. ANALYSIS (See Fiscal Note Preparation Instructions, Section III)

No fiscal impact to the Department. The agency personnel currently responsible for administering the municipal services revenue sharing program (AS 43.18.010-045), which is repealed by this bill, would assume responsibility for the shared revenue program proposed by HB 192. It is believed that the work involved for both programs is equivalent.

IV. DATE 4-3-80 PREPARED BY Mary Foster
AGENCY Community & Regional Affairs
PHONE 465-4734
Original: Legislative Finance
Budget and Management
Prime Sponsor (First Legislator Named)

THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA
COMMITTEE ON BUDGET

Bill No. House Bill No. 192
Equalization of the Tax Resources of Municipalities
Sponsored by _____

AGENCY AFFECTED: Community and Regional Affairs
PROGRAM CATEGORY AFFECTED: Community Development
BUDGET REQUEST UNIT(S) AFFECTED: Local Government Assistance - Grants

EXPENDITURES (Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 79	FY 80	FY 81	FY 82	FY 83	FY 84
PERSONAL SERVICES						
TRAVEL						
CONTRACTUAL						
COMMODITIES						
EQUIPMENT						
LAND & STRUCTURES						
GRANTS, CLAIMS, ETC.	0	27,000.0	27,000.0	27,000.0	27,000.0	27,000.0
TOTAL	0	27,000.0	27,000.0	27,000.0	27,000.0	27,000.0

REVENUE (Thousands of Dollars)

FUND	0	27,000.0	27,000.0	27,000.0	27,000.0	27,000.0
FONDS	0	0	0	0	0	0
PRO	0	0	0	0	0	0

TRANSFERS

	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0
PROFESSARY	0	0	0	0	0	0

III. ANALYSIS (See Fiscal Note Preparation Instructions, Section III)

House Bill No. 192 would repeal AS 43.18.010 - 43.18.045 which provides for State Aid to Local Governments. The Governor's FY 80 request for maintenance of this grant program is \$18,638,000.

House Bill No. 192, which calls for reform of the State Revenue Sharing Program and a minimum appropriation of \$27,000,000, would cost \$2,317,000 above the Governor's request to fund in FY 80.

The agency request for FY 80 to fund the existing Revenue Sharing Program at 100% was \$21,357,300. As the implication of the new definition of "total project cost" for construction aid [AS 43.18.010(1)] are still unclear, this figure may be insufficient for full funding.

IV. DATE 2-22-79 PREPARED BY Mary Lewis
AGENCY CEA - LGAD
PHONE 4733
Original: Legislative Finance
cc: Budget and Management
Prime Sponsor (First Legislator Named)

UNCLAS

AMENDMENT #1 approved

Page 2, line 20: Delete "utilities,"

Page 2, following line 24: Insert an additional paragraph to read:

"(E) payments received by a municipality from a utility which are in lieu of taxes levied and collected by the municipality."

JBC:jdn

*plus working in the
p. 4 to 6*

*To include in a
municipal utility*

*... provide
for collection
of ...*

AMENDMENT # 2

Will place in a separate account hospital construction funds. There will be a separate account for roads/trails and hospital and health facility operation and volunteer fire departments.

AMENDMENT # 3 Two revenue sharing studies Sec. 12 and Sec. 13 at end of bill

* Sec. 12. (a) The Department of Health and Social Services and the Department of Community and Regional Affairs shall jointly examine and their recommendations on the extent to which the state should assist municipalities, nonprofit corporations, and others in the construction and operation of hospitals and health facilities.

(b) By February 1, 1981, the commissioner of health and social services shall submit to the legislature a report, accompanied by draft legislation examining programs of state aid for hospital and health facility construction and operation, including both public and private facilities, and recommend a comprehensive health and hospital financial assistance program. The report and accompanying legislation shall be based on health care and health facility need, expressed as a function of number of beds, occupancy rate of facilities, kinds of care and levels of service provided or not provided, or other factors which the commissioner of health and social services reasonably believes should be the basis by which state assistance for hospitals and health facilities and their programs should be provided.

(c) The report and accompanying legislation presented under (b) of this section shall

AMENDMENT #3 continued

(1) include, if necessary, reference to certificates of need legislation and any other current program of the federal or state government which applies in determining whether hospitals and health care facilities shall be constructed;

(2) recommend a permanent program of state assistance to municipalities for hospital care and health care services, whether provided by public or private facilities, which improves the level of care for the people of the state.

* Sec. 3. This Act takes effect July 1, 1980.

Sec 13

It is the intent of the Legislature that the Alaska Department of Community and Regional Affairs provide, by the tenth day of the Twelfth Legislature, First Session, the Legislature with draft legislation for the funding of mass transportation through the revenue sharing formula. The Department shall also prepare a report on the current status of transit operations in the State.

In preparing draft legislation, the Department shall take into account regional differences, private and public operation of transit systems, and various options for state support. It is suggested that the Department examine the approaches to this question taken by other states.

5 Sec. 29.89.025. STATE AID TO VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENTS IN THE
6 UNORGANIZED BOROUGH. (a) The department shall pay to a volunteer fire
7 department registered with the state fire marshal and serving an area
8 not in an organized borough or city a sum for protection purposes equal
9 to \$7.50 per capita for the population served by the department, as
10 determined by the state fire marshal.

11 (b) A grant shall be made as set out in (a) of this section to
12 facilitate the organization of a volunteer fire department in an area
13 not in an organized borough or city upon application of the proposed
14 fire protection group to the state fire marshal and approval of appli-
15 cations according to standards of organization and service prescribed by
16 regulations adopted by the state fire marshal.

VERSION 1

Page 17 to existing language in (b) add clarification that the amount intended is the amount ~~of~~ of entitlement prorated during the last year of the old revenue sharing program.

VERSION 2

For the five years that follow adoption of the new revenue sharing program, no municipality may receive less than 125% of the amount received by that municipality during ~~the~~ the last fiscal year of the old program. Separate account?

Version 3

For the five years that follow adoption of the new revenue sharing program, no municipality may receive less than 125% of the amount due to ~~by~~ that municipality as its full entitlement during the last fiscal year of the old revenue sharing program. Separate account established.

VERSION 4

1. Delete (on page 17) Sec 11, subsection (a)(3).
2. Add the following to Sec. 4 (on p. 14):

Sec. 29.90.030 Minimum Entitlement Adjustment

(a) A municipality may not receive a total amount of money under AS 29.88, AS 29.89.010 and AS 29.90.020 which is less in proportion to the total amount appropriated and allocated under those sections than ninety percent (90%) of the percentage of its population to the total population of the State as determined by the Department of Labor.

(b) If the total amount that would be received by a municipality under AS 29.88, AS 29.89.010 and AS 29.90.020 would be less than as required by this section, the municipality shall receive an additional entitlement in an amount sufficient to comply with this section. In the case of boroughs that include cities which are eligible to receive funds under AS 29.88, AS 29.89 or AS 29.90.020, the funds to be received by the borough shall be deemed to include any amounts to be received by cities within the borough for purposes of this section.

(c) Amounts received by municipalities under this section are subject to proration in the manner provided by AS 29.90.010.

*See as
sep. account
established
2.5 million*

AMENDMENT # 6

AS 29.18.180(a) is amended to read:

(a) For the purpose of defraying the cost of transition to borough or city government and in order to provide for development and interim governmental operations, each borough and city incorporated after January 1, 1968, or, in the case of a second class city, incorporated or reclassified after January 1, 1968, other than a unified municipality incorporated under the provisions of AS 29.68.240 - 29.68.440 [AS 29.85], or a municipality otherwise incorporated by consolidation, is entitled to an organization grant equal to \$130 [\$10] for every voter who voted in the borough or city incorporation election. However, each incorporated borough and each first class city incorporated or established by reclassification outside an organized borough is entitled to

(1) \$125,000 for the fiscal year in which it was incorporated or reclassified;

(2) \$125,000 for the next fiscal year; and

(3) \$75,000 for the third fiscal year [AT LEAST \$25,000].

* Sec. 13. AS 29.18 is amended by adding a new section to read:

Sec. 29.18.182. ASSESSMENT ROLL. (a) The Department of Community and Regional Affairs shall establish the initial assessment roll for a borough incorporated under this chapter. The initial assessment roll shall contain the information required by AS 29.53.100(a) and shall be sufficient for computing tax levies by the municipality and for computing the amount of local effort required by the municipality under AS 14.17.021(c)(2) and 14.17.071.

(b) In the preparation of the initial assessment roll, the De-

partment of Community and Regional Affairs may contract for the services of appraisers and others whose services are required to complete the initial assessment. When completed, the initial assessment roll shall be certified by the commissioner of community and regional affairs, and the completed assessment roll, together with all supporting information and materials prepared by the Department of Community and Regional Affairs shall be transmitted to the borough assembly.

(c) The Department of Community and Regional Affairs, to the extent appropriations are available for the purpose, shall continue to pay the costs of the services of a municipal assessor and related staff for three years after the completion of the initial assessment roll.

* Sec. 14. AS 29.18.182(a), added in sec. 13 of this Act, is amended to read:

(a) The Department of Community and Regional Affairs shall establish the initial assessment roll for a borough incorporated under this chapter. The initial assessment roll shall contain the information required by AS 29.53.100(a) and shall be sufficient for computing tax levies by the municipality [AND FOR COMPUTING THE AMOUNT OF LOCAL EFFORT REQUIRED BY THE MUNICIPALITY UNDER AS 14.17.021(c)(3) AND 14.17.071].

* Sec. 15. Sections 1 - 11 of this Act take effect on the first day of the fiscal year for which \$31,000,000 or more is appropriated and allowed by the governor for distribution to municipalities and other recipients under the provisions of this Act, or on July 1, 1983, whichever is earlier.

* Sec. 16. Sections 12 - 14 of this Act take effect July 1, 1980.

* Sec. 17. Sections 15 - 17 of this Act take effect immediately in accordance with AS 01.10.070(c).



Official Business

Alaska State Legislature

Senate Committee on Community & Regional Affairs

Pouch V
State Capitol
Juneau, Alaska 99811

April 29, 1980 Minutes regarding suggested amendments

REP. GARDINER

at p. 17. 1. 10 or a new section:

For the fiscal years 1981-1985, no municipality may receive less than 125% of the amount received by that municipality during fiscal year 1980.

REP. GARDINER/REP. MCKINNON/REP. ROGERS

p.2.1.20 see attachment #1 (memo of April 24)

REP. GARDINER

suggestion to increase the \$25,000 minimum by 30-40%

ANCHORAGE MUNICIPALITY

p. 17: Sec. 11 (a) (3) delete

p. 14 a "hold harmless" provision at 90% of population (see Attachment 2)

REP. ROGERS

p. 10

Volunteer Fire Depts (see attach. 3)

REP. GARDINER

last page

correct 3 to 5 years for consistency

nity and surety bonds and premiums on insurance, legal fees, fees and expenses of trustees, depositaries, financial advisors, and paying agents for the bonds issued as the issuer considers necessary.

Sec. 29.89.025. STATE AID TO VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENTS ~~IN THE UN-ORGANIZED BOROUGH~~. (a) The state shall pay to a volunteer fire department registered with the state fire marshal and serving an area not in an organized borough or a city ^{having fire protection powers} a sum for protection purposes equal to \$7.50 per capita for the population served by the department, as determined by the state fire marshal.

(b) A grant shall be made as set out in (a) of this section to facilitate the organization of a volunteer fire department in an area not in an organized borough or a city, upon application of the proposed fire protection group to the state fire marshal and approval of applications according to standards of organization and service prescribed by regulations adopted by the state fire marshal.

(c) In this section, "fire protection" includes, but is not limited to, fire protection provided by a volunteer fire department registered with the state fire marshal which has official recognition and financial support from the community or area in which it is located.

Sec. 29.89.030. POPULATION DETERMINATION. For purposes of this chapter, population shall be determined by the latest figures of the United States Bureau of the Census or other reliable population data, including but not limited to public school enrollment figures, public utility connection, registered voters or certified employment payrolls.

Sec. 29.89.035. AREA COST-OF-LIVING DIFFERENTIAL. (a) State payments to a municipality or other eligible recipient under AS 29.89.010 and AS 29.89.015 shall reflect area cost-of-living differentials. Amounts distributed shall be based upon the sum of per capita, per mile and per bed or facility grants due each municipality or other recipient

AMENDMENTS

Offered to: SCS CSHB 192 (May 1, 1980)

Offered by: Senate Community and Regional Affairs Committee

AMENDMENT # 1:

ok ✓ Page 2, line 21: Delete "utilities,"

✓ Page 2, following line 25: Insert an additional paragraph to read:

"(E) payments received by a municipality from a utility which are in lieu of taxes levied and collected by the municipality."

✓ [Additional material to be provided by Lee Sharp, not received.]

incl Lee Sharp

AMENDMENT # 2:

sep category in 29 ✓ Page 9, line 6 - page 10, line 4:
Delete AS 29.89.020 in its entirety and incorporate as a new program in AS 18.05. The committee should instruct whether this component shall continue to be administered by the Department of Community and Regional Affairs.

ma sep account in 29

file - orig version - delete ✓ AMENDMENT # 3:

Page 10: Delete lines 17 - 20.

AMENDMENT # 4:

[The committee will have to decide on the approach to be taken. I am unable to provide four versions of language in the time provided.]

Use # 4

AMENDMENT # 5:

Instructions not given. . . .

AMENDMENT # 6:

✓ Page 10, delete lines 21 - 23.

[If this amendment is agreed to, subsequent internal citations in AS 29.89 will have to be checked and modified as necessary.]

Amended ok



THE CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU

CAPITAL OF ALASKA

155 SOUTH SEWARD ST. JUNEAU, ALASKA 99801

May 1, 1980

The Honorable Arliss Sturgulewski
Chairman, Senate Community and
Regional Affairs Committee
Pouch "V" State Capitol Building
Juneau, Alaska 99811

FILE: Legislation-1980

SUBJECT: CSHB 192(am)

Dear Senator Sturgulewski:

The following change on page 4 of CSHB 192(Finance)(am) would provide for a simple means of adjusting the assessed value of a municipality to take into account the value of those utilities for which payments in lieu of taxes are made.

In line 8 on page 4 of the bill, delete the period after "AS 14.17.140" and add the following:

and shall include, in addition, for each utility for which a payment in lieu of taxes is made, the computed assessed value of the utility. The computed assessed value of the utility shall be the amount computed by dividing the applicable millage rate into the amount of the payment in lieu of taxes made by the utility.

This should provide a simple method of computing the assumed value of the utility for which the payments in lieu of taxes are made. This addition should be made so that the municipalities with privately owned utilities are not penalized for permitting private industry to provide those utility services.

Sincerely,

Gerald L. Sharp
City-Borough Attorney

AMENDMENT #1 approved

Utilities

(ok)

Page 2, line 20: Delete "utilities,"

Page 2, following line 24: Insert an additional paragraph to read:

"(E) payments received by a municipality from a utility which are in lieu of taxes levied and collected by the municipality."

JBC:jdn

plus wording for see sharp
p. 4 l. 6

to include value of
municipal utility

main formula
for determination
of net value
of utility

AMENDMENT # 2

Will place in a separate account hospital construction funds. There will be a separate account for roads/trails and hospital ~~operation~~ *health care facility*

operation & volunteer fire departments.

AMENDMENT # 3 Two revenue sharing studies Sec. 12 and Sec. 13 at end of bill

* Sec. 12. (a) The Department of Health and Social Services and the Department of Community and Regional Affairs shall jointly examine and report their recommendations on the extent to which the state should assist municipalities, nonprofit corporations, and others in the construction and operation of hospitals and health facilities.

(b) By February 1, 1981, the commissioner of health and social services shall submit to the legislature a report, accompanied by draft legislation, examining programs of state aid for hospital and health facility construction and operation, including both public and private facilities, and recommending a comprehensive health and hospital financial assistance program. The report and accompanying legislation shall be based on health care and health facility need, expressed as a function of number of beds, occupancy rate of facilities, kinds of care and levels of service provided or not provided, or any other factors which the commissioner of health and social services reasonably believes should be the basis by which state assistance for hospitals and health facilities and their programs should be provided.

(c) The report and accompanying legislation presented under (b) of this section shall

AMENDMENT #3 continued

(1) include, if necessary, reference to certificates of need legislation and any other current program of the federal or state government which applies in determining whether hospitals and health care facilities shall be constructed;

(2) recommend a permanent program of state assistance to municipalities for hospital care and health care services, whether provided by public or private facilities, which improves the level of care for the people of the state.

* Sec. 3. This Act takes effect July 1, 1980.

See 13

It is the intent of the Legislature that the Alaska Department of Community and Regional Affairs provide, by the tenth day of the Twelfth Legislature, First Session, the Legislature with draft legislation for the funding of mass transportation through the revenue sharing formula. The Department shall also prepare a report on the current status of transit operations in the State.

In preparing draft legislation, the Department shall take into account regional differences, private and public operation of transit systems, and various options for state support. It is suggested that the Department examine the approaches to this question taken by other states.

OK

5 Sec. 29.89.025. STATE AID TO VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENTS IN THE
6 UNORGANIZED BOROUGH. (a) The department shall pay to a volunteer fire
7 department registered with the state fire marshal and serving an area
8 not in an organized borough or city a sum for protection purposes equal
9 to \$7.50 per capita for the population served by the department, as
10 determined by the state fire marshal.

11 (b) A grant shall be made as set out in (a) of this section to
12 facilitate the organization of a volunteer fire department in an area
13 not in an organized borough or city upon application of the proposed
14 fire protection group to the state fire marshal and approval of appli-
15 cations according to standards of organization and service prescribed by
16 regulations adopted by the state fire marshal.

AMENDMENT # 5

VERSION 1

Page 17 to existing language in (b) add clarification that the amount intended is the amount ~~prorated under the~~ of entitlement prorated during the last year of the old revenue sharing program.

VERSION 2

For the five years that follow adoption of the new revenue sharing program, no municipality may receive less than 125% of the amount ^{actually} received by that municipality during ~~fixed~~ the last fiscal year of the old program. ~~Separate account?~~

Version 3

For the five years that follow adoption of the new revenue sharing program, no municipality may receive less than 125% of the amount due to ~~by~~ that municipality as its ~~full~~ entitlement during the last fiscal year of the old revenue sharing program. ~~Separate account established.~~

VERSION 4

1. Delete (on page 17) Sec 11, subsection (a)(3).
2. Add the following to Sec. 4 (on p. 14):

Sec. 29.90.030 Minimum Entitlement Adjustment

(a) A municipality may not receive a total amount of money under AS 29.88, AS 29.89.010 and AS 29.90.020 which is less in proportion to the total amount appropriated and allocated under those sections than ninety percent (90%) of the percentage of its population to the total population of the State as determined by the Department of Labor.

(b) If the total amount that would be received by a municipality under AS 29.88, AS 29.89.010 and AS 29.90.020 would be less than as required by this section, the municipality shall receive an additional entitlement in an amount sufficient to comply with this section. In the case of boroughs that include cities which are eligible to receive funds under AS 29.88, AS 29.89 or AS 29.90.020, the funds to be received by the borough shall be deemed to include any amounts to be received by cities within the borough for purposes of this section.

(c) Amounts received by municipalities under this section are subject to proration in the manner provided by AS 29.90.010.

→ seen as sep. account incorporated
2.5 million

SIC
KODIAK
074

"GUARANTEED MINIMUM INCREASE" = 5.2 million additional

20
10/10/88
10/10/88

NO

AS 29.18.180(a) is amended to read:

7 (a) For the purpose of defraying the cost of transition to borough
8 or city government and in order to provide for development and interim
9 governmental operations, each borough and city incorporated after
10 January 1, 1968, or, in the case of a second class city, incorporated or
11 reclassified after January 1, 1968, other than a unified municipality
12 incorporated under the provisions of AS 29.68.240 - 29.68.440 [AS 29.85],
13 or a municipality otherwise incorporated by consolidation, is entitled
14 to an organization grant equal to \$130 [\$10] for every voter who voted
15 in the borough or city incorporation election. However, each incor-
16 porated borough and each first class city incorporated or established by
reclassification outside an organized borough is entitled to

17 (1) \$125,000 for the fiscal year in which it was incorporated
18 or reclassified;

19 (2) \$125,000 for the next fiscal year; and

20 (3) \$75,000 for the third fiscal year [AT LEAST \$25,000].

21 * Sec. 13. AS 29.18 is amended by adding a new section to read:

22 Sec. 29.18.182. ASSESSMENT ROLL. (a) The Department of Community
23 and Regional Affairs shall establish the initial assessment roll for a
24 borough incorporated under this chapter. The initial assessment roll
25 shall contain the information required by AS 29.53.100(a) and shall be
26 sufficient for computing tax levies by the municipality and for
27 computing the amount of local effort required by the municipality under
28 AS 14.17.021(c)(3) and 14.17.071.

29 (b) In the preparation of the initial assessment roll, the De-

AMENDMENT # 6 cont

1 partment of Community and Regional Affairs may contract for the services
2 of appraisers and others whose services are required to complete the
3 initial assessment. When completed, the initial assessment roll shall
4 be certified by the commissioner of community and regional affairs, and
5 the completed assessment roll, together with all supporting information
6 and materials prepared by the Department of Community and Regional
7 Affairs shall be transmitted to the borough assembly.

8 (c) The Department of Community and Regional Affairs, to the
9 extent appropriations are available for the purpose, shall continue to
10 pay the costs of the services of a municipal assessor and related staff
11 for three years after the completion of the initial assessment roll.

12 * Sec. 14. AS 29.18.182(a), added in sec. 13 of this Act, is amended to
13 read:

14 (a) The Department of Community and Regional Affairs shall estab-
15 lish the initial assessment roll for a borough incorporated under this
16 chapter. The initial assessment roll shall contain the information
17 required by AS 29.53.100(a) and shall be sufficient for computing tax
18 levies by the municipality [AND FOR COMPUTING THE AMOUNT OF LOCAL EFFORT
19 REQUIRED BY THE MUNICIPALITY UNDER AS 14.17.021(c)(3) AND 14.17.071].

20 Sec. 15. Sections 1 - 11 of this Act take effect on the first day of
21 the fiscal year for which \$31,000,000 or more is appropriated and allowed by
22 the governor for distribution to municipalities and other recipients under
23 the provisions of this Act, or on July 1, 1983, whichever is earlier.

24 * Sec. 16. Sections 12 - 14 of this Act take effect July 1, 1980.

25 * Sec. 17. Sections 15 - 17 of this Act take effect immediately in
26 accordance with AS 01.10.070(c).

1. Delete (on page 17) Sec 11, subsection (a) (3).
2. Add the following to Sec. 4 (on p. 14):

Sec. 29.90.030 Minimum Entitlement Adjustment

(a) A municipality may not receive a total amount of money under AS 29.88, AS 29.89.010 and AS 29.90.020 which is less in proportion to the total amount appropriated and allocated under those sections than ninety percent (90%) of the percentage of its population to the total population of the State as determined by the Department of Labor.

(b) If the total amount that would be received by a municipality under AS 29.88, AS 29.89.010 and AS 29.90.020 would be less than as required by this section, the municipality shall receive an additional entitlement in an amount sufficient to comply with this section. In the case of boroughs that include cities which are eligible to receive funds under AS 29.88, AS 29.89 or AS 29.90.020, the funds to be received by the borough shall be deemed to include any amounts to be received by cities within the borough for purposes of this section.

(c) Amounts received by municipalities under this section are subject to proration in the manner provided by AS 29.90.010.

*seen as
sep. account
funded at
2.5 million*

ESTIMATE OF ADDITIONAL FUNDING REQUIRED FOR PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO STATE REVENUE SHARING BILL

BOROUGH/CITIES	POPULATION	% OF STATE ^(a) POPULATION	90% OF PREVIOUS COLUMN	(b)		
				\$22,740,838 FUNDING LEVEL		
				AMOUNT	% OF STATE TOTAL	ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT
Anchorage	197,788	47.70%	42.93%	3,190,667	36.02%	1,571,392
<u>Fairbanks North Star Borough</u>	<u>60,227</u>	14.52%	13.07%	1,678,050		
Fairbanks (including Military Annex)	36,457			1,569,393		
North Pole	461			51,024		
				<u>3,298,467</u>	<u>14.50%</u>	<u>-0-</u>
<u>Kenai Peninsula Borough</u>	<u>24,611</u>	5.94%	5.35%	362,211		
Homer	1,802			84,014		
Seward	2,279			112,874		
Kenai	5,364			359,645		
Soldotna	2,586			196,176		
Seldovia	612			37,660		
Kachemak	151			23,548		
				<u>1,176,128</u>	<u>5.17%</u>	<u>40,934</u>
<u>Ketchikan Gateway Borough</u>	<u>11,990</u>	2.89%	2.60%	283,420		
Ketchikan	7,928			494,067		
Saxman	272			22,788		
				<u>800,275</u>	<u>3.52%</u>	<u>-0-</u>
<u>Kodiak Island Borough</u>	<u>7,901</u>	1.91%	1.72%	160,848		
Kodiak	4,960			206,791		
Quzinkie	170			23,777		
Port Lions	227			24,346		
Larsen Bay	137			23,548		
Old Harbor	327			25,004		
Akhiok	102			24,857		
				<u>489,171</u>	<u>2.15%</u>	<u>-0-</u>

(a) Total Population for Revenue Sharing Applications
 Cities within Boroughs
 Total State Population

485,754
 -71,091
 414,663

(b) Without MUSA; including hospital
 pass-thru funding

BOROUGH/CITIES	POPULATION	% OF STATE POPULATION	90% OF PREVIOUS COLUMN	\$22,740,838 FUNDING LEVEL		
				AMOUNT	% OF STATE TOTAL	ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT
<u>Maranuska-Susitna Borough</u>	<u>16,724</u>	4.03%	3.63%	824,136		
Palmer	1,859			137,634		
Houston	375			66,134		
Wasilla	1,566			114,200		
				<u>1,142,104</u>	5.02%	-0-
<u>North Slope Borough</u>	<u>9,139</u>	2.20%	1.98%	229,352		
Wainwright	341			29,298		
Anatuvuk	150			29,298		
Kaktovik	123			29,298		
Barrow	2,306			59,110		
Point Hope	384			29,298		
Nuiqut	152			29,298		
				<u>434,952</u>	1.91%	15,919
Sitka	8,787	2.12%	1.91%	254,978	1.12%	179,652
Galena	898	0.22%	0.20%	33,844	0.15%	11,370
Kake	679	0.16%	0.14%	26,350	0.12%	4,548
Alakanuk	527	0.13%	0.12%	31,009	0.14%	-0-
Anderson	698	0.17%	0.15%	31,333	0.14%	2,274
Delta Junction	892	0.22%	0.20%	28,197	0.12%	18,193
Emmonak	545	0.13%	0.12%	29,826	0.13%	-0-
Hooper Bay	590	0.14%	0.13%	28,477	0.13%	-0-
Roarvik	527	0.13%	0.12%	30,194	0.13%	-0-
Selawik	521	0.13%	0.12%	29,298	0.13%	-0-
Valdez	7,483	1.80%	1.62%	136,868	0.60%	231,957
TOTAL ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT						2,076,239

STATE OF ALASKA THE LEGISLATURE

POUCH - STATE CAPITOL
JUNEAU ALASKA 99801
907-465-3800

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS AGENCY

MEMORANDUM

February 2, 1979

SUBJECT: Sectional Analysis of the Municipal League's
Revenue Sharing Reform Proposal
(Work Order No. 6162)

TO: Representative Terry Gardiner

FROM: John B. Chenoweth
Legislative Council

JW John Williams
Policy Analyst

In response to your request of the Legislative Council on July 21, 1978, we have participated with a special committee of the Alaska Municipal League in drafting a revenue sharing reform bill, which is now complete. The Board of Directors of the League approved the draft at its meeting in Juneau on January 19, 1979 (copy enclosed).

Following is a sectional analysis of the committee's product.

*Section 1. PURPOSE.

Three purposes are stated: (1) equity of allocation of state resources with municipalities; (2) basic support to municipalities for public services irrespective of physical location of taxable wealth; and (3) improvement of the administrative capacity of less populous municipalities.

*Section 2. CHAPTER 88.

This chapter contains the major revision of the revenue sharing program. In the most general terms, it provides for the computation and distribution of an "equalization entitlement" for local government services in accordance with a formula and schedules set out in the sections incorporated in the chapter.

Sec. 29.88.010 specifies the method that is utilized to distribute revenues under the chapter. Three factors are

applicable: population, revenue generation, and property value base.¹ The formula multiplies the population of the taxing unit¹ by the mill rate equivalent of allowed revenues² generated by the municipality. The sum of allowed revenues is divided by one-thousandth of the full and true taxable property value within the taxing jurisdiction. The resultant quotient is referred to as the "local effort" for the municipality: it is equal to the full and true mill rate equivalent of all allowed revenues generated by each municipality.

Sec. 29.88.015 specifies the means whereby population numbers shall be determined. Generally, Bureau of the Census data will be utilized; however, other reliable data in the judgment of the Department of Community and Regional Affairs may be used. The provision for population count is not unlike the provision of the current state aid program. Unlike the current program, however, no separate treatment is given the counting of persons who are residents of military reservations.

Sec. 29.88.020 describes the means whereby mill rate equivalent determinations will be made. Initially, a certified statement submitted by each municipality, on a form provided by the department, will specify the revenues generated in each municipality. This shall be accomplished by all municipalities by

1/ A "taxing unit" is defined, for purposes of this program as "a city, borough, unified municipality, or service area or differential tax zone."

2/ Allowed revenues include tax revenues plus other revenues which will diminish the necessity of incremental tax revenues, including inspection fees, permits, fines, penalties, use fees, and income from mass transit, offstreet parking, and recreation programs. Revenues not allowed for inclusion are tax revenues used to subsidize utilities commonly run by private businesses (as defined in sec. 45 of this chapter), interest on investments, income from the sale or lease of land or equipment, and revenues from any other source.

October 15. By December 15, the department is to make a final determination for each municipality, after reviewing all financial audits and statements submitted by the municipalities. Any adjustments made to the figures initially submitted by a municipality shall be reported to the municipality along with the revised figures.

Full and true property values shall be determined in the manner provided in AS 14.17.140 (state aid to education). In municipalities which are not school districts and thus not covered by the provisions of AS 14.17, the state assessor shall, at least once each three years, estimate the property value for all cities with populations of 750 or more. For cities which are not school districts, and which have populations less than 750, estimated property values will be determined by averaging the per capita property values of all cities having populations less than 750 and for which assessments are completed.

Sec. 29.88.025 specifies the necessary documentation that would be supplied to the department by each municipality in support of its application. The fiscal information is to be for the fiscal year which precedes the fiscal for which the entitlement is sought.

Sec. 29.88.030: As with present law, the bill provides for entitlements to be returned to the taxing unit for which the entitlement was earned. There are two exceptions: 15 percent of an area-wide entitlement may be used for non area-wide purposes, and, the local government may decide the taxing jurisdiction that is to receive the entitlement generated by non-tax revenues (fees, permits, etc).

Sec. 29.88.035 establishes the tax equalization account from which entitlements earned under this chapter will be paid. The total appropriation to the account is to be distributed by prorating entitlements.

Sec. 29.88.040 gives the department authority to adopt, amend and repeal regulations necessary to implement the chapter. The regulations would contain provisions for obtaining information, set filing dates, providing notification to municipalities with respect to changes made by the department with regard to any entitlement, and a reasonable time for a municipality to respond to decisions of the department. In response

to some specific complaints by several of the Municipal League representatives who worked on the draft, language has been inserted by which the department is directed to supply application assistance to municipalities. Additionally, the department is empowered to extend the definition of utilities (section 045 of this chapter) to cover additional enterprise activities for which no working classification has been provided by statute.

Sec. 29.88.045 defines terms used in the chapter, including 'taxing unit' and 'utilities'.

*Section 3. CHAPTER 89.

Chapter 89 is, in substance, a restatement of present law regarding entitlements earned for road maintenance, health facilities and hospitals, construction aid, and volunteer fire departments in the unorganized borough. The following changes have been made from present law: (1) public road maintenance entitlements are based on \$2500/mile (present law is \$1500/mile); (2) ice road maintenance is based on \$1500/mile (present law is \$900/mile); (3) construction aid for hospitals is not multiplied by the cost of living factor, as is the case in present law; and (4) municipalities which exercise a health power will not receive a \$2 per capita distribution.

Generally, this portion of present law which is saved in the Municipal League's draft bill provides for health related entitlements according to the following: (1) for hospitals with 10 or more beds -- the greater of \$1,000 per bed or \$75,000 per facility, (2) for hospitals with fewer than 10 beds -- the greater of \$1,000 per bed or \$25,000 per facility; (3) for health facilities -- \$1,000 per bed or \$4,000 per facility; (4) the entire entitlement received for health purposes must be used for health purposes; (5) for hospitals which were begun after January 1, 1968, the greater of \$2,500 per bed or 5 percent of the construction cost annually until the total payment equals 25 percent of the total construction cost; and (6) for volunteer fire departments in the unorganized borough, \$7.50 per capita. Entitlements earned under this section (except for hospital construction) are multiplied by an area cost of living differential, determined under AS 29.27.030.

Section 29.89.040 establishes a miscellaneous services account, from which payments are made under this chapter.

*Section 4. CHAPTER 90.

Sec. 29.90.010 precludes an interpretation of the general administrative provisions of the state aid program to create of a debt to the state.

Sec. 29.90.020 directs the department to allocate funds from the two accounts established (AS 29.88.035 and AS 29.89.040) and further provides that any excess funds existing in the miscellaneous services account (Chapter 89) shall then be added to the tax equalization account (Chapter 88).

Subsection (b) describes the means for determining proration of funds allocated under the equalization formula of Chapter 88 and under the minimum entitlement provisions of AS 29.90.030. After the Chapter 88 and Chapter 89 entitlements have been determined, the amount necessary to guarantee the minimum entitlement provided for in Sec. 29.90.030 is calculated and all Chapter 88 municipal entitlements are proportionally reduced so that the sum of payments under Chapter 88 and under AS 29.90.030 equal the amount available in the tax equalization account.

Sec. 29.90.030 provides for payment of minimum entitlements. All municipalities are guaranteed a minimum of \$25,000 (plus the cost of living allowance for their area) if (1) a regular election has been held; (2) regular council meetings have been conducted; (3) the municipality has adopted a budget; (4) local ordinances have been codified; and (5) some degree of municipal administration is provided for through a manager, clerk, or other part-time or full-time officer.

*Sections 5 - 9.

These sections make correlative changes in AS 29 required by the state aid program changes, and are generally self-explanatory.

*Section 10.

The section repeals the statutory basis of the present program of state aid to local governments.

*Section 11: "Hold Harmless"

Section 11 specifies that, for three years after this act becomes effective, no municipality will receive less than its actual entitlement earned in the last year that the present law is applied.

*Section 12

The section specifies that the act becomes effective when \$27,000,000 is appropriated to the program, or July 1, 1982, whichever is earlier.

JBC:JW:jdn

Enclosure

person may be convicted for a violation of §§ 230 — 260 of this chapter unless it appears to the satisfaction of the court that the provisions of this section have been substantially complied with by the hospital. (§ 4 ch 40 SLA 1960)

Sec. 18.20.250. Receipt of services without intent to pay a misdemeanor. A person who requests and receives hospital care including board, room, surgical care, medical care, or related services or drugs or other medication, or any combination of them from a general hospital, with the intent not to pay the amount due and the amount which becomes due for one or more of the items or who obtains credit from a general hospital for the items by intentionally giving and furnishing false information as to name, address, employment or property unless the items furnished are fully paid for, is guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction is punishable by imprisonment in a jail for not more than one year, or by a fine of not more than \$1,000, or by both. (§ 2 ch 40 SLA 1960)

Sec. 18.20.260. Definitions. In §§ 230 — 260 of this chapter "general hospital" means a hospital which offers its services to the public and which receives all patients as they apply, to the extent its capacity and facilities permit and in accordance with the rules and regulations established by it. (§ 1 ch 40 SLA 1960)

Chapter 25. Assistance to Hospitals and Health Facilities.

Article

1. Construction and Equipment Aid to Nonprofit Hospitals (§§ 18.25.010 — 18.25.030)
2. Aid for Operation Deficits of Community Operated Nonprofit Hospitals and Clinics (§§ 18.25.040 — 18.25.060)
3. Assistance for Community Health Facilities (§§ 18.25.070 — 18.25.110)
4. General Provisions (§ 18.25.120)

Article 1. Construction and Equipment Aid to Nonprofit Hospitals.

Section	Section
10. Department to render aid	30. Intent
20. Determination of necessity	

Sec. 18.25.010. Department to render aid. The department may facilitate the purchase, construction and repair of, and obtain necessary equipment for, nonprofit hospitals operated by municipalities, communities and associations in the state. (§ 1 ch 81 SLA 1949; am § 1 ch 107 SLA 1953)

Sec. 18.25.020. Determination of necessity. The department shall initiate appropriate action under §§ 10 — 30 of this chapter when it determines which projects are of most immediate necessity, and shall allot money to the municipalities, communities and associations on a

matching basis, or in accordance with their financial ability and urgency of the need. (§ 2 ch 81 SLA 1949; am § 2 ch 107 SLA 1953)

Sec. 18.25.030. Intent. It is the intent of §§ 10 — 30 of this chapter to provide financial aid to municipalities, communities and associations for which an attempt at complete financing by themselves of a necessary project would entail great hardship. It is also intended that the department utilize the money authorized under §§ 10 — 30 of this chapter so far as can be arranged to assist the municipalities, communities and associations in matching funds with the federal government under applicable federal law for hospital assistance. (§ 3 ch 81 SLA 1949; am § 3 ch 107 SLA 1953)

Article 2. Aid for Operation Deficits of Community Operated Nonprofit Hospitals and Clinics.

Section	Section
40. Department to render aid	60. Intent
50. Determination of necessity	

Sec. 18.25.040. Department to render aid. The department may assist in cases of operational deficits of community operated nonprofit hospitals and clinics in the state. (§ 1 ch 96 SLA 1949)

Sec. 18.25.050. Determination of necessity. The department shall initiate appropriate action in accordance with the provisions of §§ 40 — 60 of this chapter as soon as the department determines which projects are of most immediate necessity. (§ 2 ch 96 SLA 1949)

Sec. 18.25.060. Intent. It is the intent of §§ 40 — 60 of this chapter to provide financial aid, or funds to match available federal funds to aid localities or municipalities whose taxable values are limited in scope and for whom an attempt at community financing of a community operated nonprofit hospital or clinic would entail insurmountable hardship. (§ 3 ch 96 SLA 1949)

Article 3. Assistance for Community Health Facilities.

Section	Section
70. Department to render assistance	100. Regulations authorized
80. Intent and purpose	110. Report to legislature of grants made
90. Use of purchases	

Sec. 18.25.070. Department to render assistance. The department may assist in the purchase, construction, repair, and equipping of facilities to improve and protect community health, and may provide financial assistance for the operation of the facilities in case of operational deficits. (§ 1 ch 117 SLA 1951)

Sec. 18.25.080. Intent and purpose. It is the intent of §§ 70 — 110 of this chapter to assist communities and areas in developing and improving health service facilities by the purchase, construction,

renovation, or establishment of hospitals, health centers, or clinics, or quarters for personnel, and the purchase of furnishings, supplies and equipment and making the other expenditures necessary to carry out the purpose of §§ 70 — 110 of this chapter. Assistance is to be given in areas which would otherwise be denied adequate facilities, because the taxable values are limited in scope and an attempt at total community financing of a project would cause hardship or prevent its realization. It is also intended that the department utilize the money authorized under §§ 70 — 110 of this chapter so far as can be arranged to assist municipalities in matching funds with the federal government under federal law. (§ 2 ch 117 SLA 1951)

Sec. 18.25.090. Use of purchases. Purchases under §§ 70 — 110 of this chapter are to be used for the purpose for which appropriated and when the purpose is discontinued the items shall be returned to the department for use elsewhere. (§ 3 ch 117 SLA 1951)

Sec. 18.25.100. Regulations authorized. The department shall adopt rules and regulations for

(1) the establishment of criteria, minimum requirements and standards for assistance to communities under §§ 70 — 110 of this chapter;

(2) the establishment of the fiscal and accounting procedures and controls considered necessary for the payment of grants;

(3) the compilation of data and information from the communities concerned which will support the need for assistance under §§ 70 — 110 of this chapter;

(4) the establishment of procedures by which communities may apply for assistance;

(5) accepting financial or other assistance from the federal government under federal law to carry out the purpose of §§ 70 — 110 of this chapter through matching funds or grants;

(6) cooperation and coordination with other state boards, departments or agencies engaged in construction programs in areas applying for assistance under §§ 70 — 110 of this chapter. (§ 4 ch 117 SLA 1951)

Sec. 18.25.110. Report to legislature of grants made. Within 10 days of the convening of each legislative session, the department shall submit a report of grants made under §§ 70—110 of this chapter. (§ 5 ch 117 SLA 1951)

Article 4. General Provisions.

Section 120. Definitions

Sec. 18.25.120. Definitions. In this chapter "department" means the Department of Health and Social Services. (am § 6 ch 104 SLA 1971)

Effect of amendment. — The 1971 Health and Social Services" for amendment substituted "Department of "Department of Health and Welfare."

Chapter 30. Air Pollution.

Section 05—250. [Repealed]

Secs. 18.30.005—18.30.250.
Repealed by § 4 ch 120 SLA 1971.

Editor's note. — The repealed chapter derived from § 2, ch. 86, SLA 1969; § 6, ch. 104, SLA 1971.

Section 5, ch. 120, SLA 1971, provides: "All litigation, hearings, investigations and other proceedings pending under any law amended or functions which may be transferred by this Act, continue in effect and may be continued and completed notwithstanding any such transfer or amendment provided for in this Act. Certificates, orders, rules or regulations issued or filed under authority of a law amended by this Act or functions which

may be transferred by this Act, remain in effect for the term issued, unless or until revoked, vacated, or otherwise modified under the provisions of this Act. All contracts or other obligations created by any law amended by this Act or by virtue of functions which may be transferred by this Act, and in effect on July 1, 1971, remain in effect unless or until revoked, or modified under the provisions of this Act."

Legislative committee report. — For report on ch. 120, SLA 1971 (SB 75 am H), see 1971 House Journal, p. 1016.

Chapter 33. Pesticides Control Board.

Section 10—100. [Repealed]

Secs. 18.33.010—18.33.100.
Repealed by § 4 ch 120 SLA 1971.

Editor's note. — The repealed chapter derived from § 1, ch. 166, SLA 1970.

Section 5, ch. 120, SLA 1971, provides: "All litigation, hearings, investigations and other proceedings pending under any law amended or functions which may be transferred by this Act, continue in effect and may be continued and completed notwithstanding any such transfer or amendment provided for in this Act. Certificates, orders, rules or regulations issued or filed under authority of a law amended by this Act or functions which

may be transferred by this Act, remain in effect for the term issued, unless or until revoked, vacated, or otherwise modified under the provisions of this Act. All contracts or other obligations created by any law amended by this Act or by virtue of functions which may be transferred by this Act, and in effect on July 1, 1971, remain in effect unless or until revoked, or modified under the provisions of this Act."

Legislative committee report. — For report on ch. 120, SLA 1971 (SB 75 am H), see 1971 House Journal, p. 1016.

Chapter 35. Public Accommodations and Facilities.

Article

- 1. Tourist and Trailer Camps, Motor Courts and Motels (§§ 18.35.010 — 18.35.090)
- 2. Restaurants and Taverns (§§ 18.35.100—18.35.120)
- 3. Facilities and Special Events Open to General Public (§§ 18.35.200 — 18.35.230)

Article 1. Tourist and Trailer Camps, Motor Courts and Motels.

- Section 10. Purpose.**
- 20. Administration of laws and regulations**
- 30. Regulations**
- 40. Permits**
- 50. Maintaining accommodations without**

- Section**
permit or after suspension of permit a misdemeanor
- 60. Unlawful disposal of wastes**
- 70. Posting laws and regulations**
- 80. Penalty for noncompliance**
- 90. Definitions**