


ALASKA LEGISLATURE COMMITTEE FILES 1985-1986 86/2

3873 SCRA SB 324 - SB 335



RECORDS CERTIFICATION

I, the undersigned, an employee of the State of Alaska, do hereby certify that the microfilm images on this microform are accurate reproductions of the original records of the State of Alaska as accumulated during the regular course of business, and that it is the established policy and practice of this State to microfilm its records and to dispose of the original records after microfilm reproductions have been made.


Signature of Camera Operator


Date

S B

3 2 4

COMMITTEE REPORT
SENATE

FURTHER: Finance

1/13/86

Date Feb 18, 1986

Mr. President

The Committee on C&RA considered SB 324
relating to grants for water quality enhancement programs; efd.

and (a majority of the committee) (the committee) reports it back with the following recommendations:

- do pass
- do pass with attached amendment(s)
- replace with/or adopt CS for _____
- new title
- same title and recommends _____
- and attached a "LETTER OF INTENT" NEW FISCAL NOTE
- reports it back without recommendation
- recommends referral to _____ Committee

MEMBERS SIGNING
DO PASS

MEMBERS HAVING
OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS

V. Fischer

J. ...

William Sturgis

J. ...

Edna De Vin
Chairman

Do Pass
Chairman recommendation



Official Business

Alaska State Legislature

Senate

Committee on Community and Regional Affairs

Senator Edna DeVries, Chairman

Members:
Senator Ferguson, Vice Chairman
Senator Coghill
Senator Sturgulewski
Senator V. Fischer

Pouch V
Juneau, Alaska 99811

February 18, 1986

C&RA Meeting

SB 324 -- Grants for water quality enhancement programs

SB 335 -- GO Bonds for water/sewer/solid waste
\$166,001,000

Persons confirming attendance for testimony and/or observation:

Mark Johnson, representing Senator Kelly

Bill Ross, Commissioner DEC

Dick Marcum, Actng Dir, Div of Facility Construction
and Operation, DEC

Gary Hayden, Dir, Div of Facility Construction
and Operation, DEC (Mr. Hayden is a "maybe"...due
to the fact that he became a new Father this morning)

SB 324: Has a companion bill in the House -- HB 461
Both bills have a zero fiscal note

Attached is: 1) letter of support from Muni of
Anchorage
2) Explanation for bill from Senator
Kelly

SB 335 -- Has a fiscal note from Dept of Revenue of \$5,920,000
for FY 1987.

Attached is: 1) fiscal note with explanation
2) Memo from bill sponsor, Senator
Ferguson

Additional attachments:

- 1) Ltr from Akiachak Native Community
- 2) Article 4, AS 29.68.500 providing for Dissolution; and
Articles 1. and 2., AS 29.68.010 providing for Annexation
and Exclusion and Merger and Consolidation
- 3) Draft Senate Joint Resolution

CaRA

Feb 18th

Johnson for Tim Kelly
Mark Kelly on SB 324 - in support

Bill Ross

Supports SB 324

Campbell Creek so bad - had to cancel Campbell Co Classic
\$110,000 from Gov
200,000 from City to test purity
of rivers

we passed \$10 mil bond issue for
water clean-up

Coghell

- if safe water - b' be spending
on cleaning up lakes

Ross

- No, we would still deal w/ funda-
mentals 1st.

Ferg

335 It is my understanding
that no general obligation bond bill is
going to pass the Senate this year -
therefore don't want to waste
the Commissioner's time, or

Coghill - Disagree, we need a clear-cut record.
I want to put it on record that if the NS Boro sues the State, the Leg will not be responsible for paying.

Ferguson - If I were asked, I would say that they save their money on legal fees.

Delvies - Need to put some things on record by voting res. up or down - because other areas want to detach -- Lake Louise, Eagle River, Selcha.

V Fischer - What you do here doesn't affect other detachments.

COMTE. adjourned 4:17p

the Committee's time

Fisher

SB 448 home rule powers to 2nd class cities

(ask DC&RA to suggest way to handle dissolution - then Committee review)

With this bill (SB448) also hear proposal from DC&RA on how to handle dissolution.

Coghill

6 of 6 of -B / resolution / is a hearing to be put on record what Leg 6 is in detachment of land areas, and what the Leg ~~responsibility~~ responsibility is for this type of action.

Do have reservation about DC&RA getting into this - 6 LBC ✓ this and not the Dept.

7 of 2 a message p 6 of the Constitution ✓ stay on watersheds in drawing lines.

Sen Ferguson I was C. / v impartial and not vote until the Senate floor, but -
a no. of people in Kotzebue who don't want a Boro don't want taxation.

Around 1992 Assembly for us, boro (leg) will meet -> for unorganized boro. Our boro -> by the Leg & by our people. Therefore we need a boro.

Ferguson, I may not like the resolution but we need to.

Fischer

Would not want to introduce legislation. Dialog was very shrill, but tempers have cooled. Essentially NS Boro is accepting the detachment at this time. If we do this, we will look like we support the resolution.

St. g

I have concerns about introducing the resolution. Oppor to see another Boro is good.

Municipality
of
Anchorage



P.O. BOX 6-650
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99502-0650
(907) 264-4960

TONY KNOWLES,
MAYOR

INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

December 12, 1985

Sen. Tim Kelly
283 Muldoon Road
Station Box 76
Anchorage, Alaska 99504

SB 324

Re: Revisions to Title 46 to Water Quality Enhancement

Dear Sen. Kelly:


The Water Quality Council of the Municipality of Anchorage has reviewed this matter again recently, and it heartily supports your draft bill to add surface and subsurface water quality enhancement to the DEC 50/50 match program.

Anchorage is making progress in the matter of surface and groundwater pollution through defining accurately the problem, searching out point sources of contamination, planning for better drainage, and raising public consciousness about the need for more sewers. Two state grants in 1985 - \$110,000 from the Governor's contingency fund and \$200,000 appropriation from the Legislature through DEC, have helped us greatly in these efforts.

Also, as you know, Anchorage citizens approved in October the sale of \$15 million in sewer bonds and \$10 million for various water quality projects including purchase of wetlands and buffer zones along certain endangered streams and other projects to halt or reverse degradation.

We appreciate your concern and leadership in this matter. We offer our assistance in helping you achieve passage of your proposed amendments to Title 46.

Sincerely yours,


Chip Dennerlein

copy under
main

TENTH ALASKA LEGISLATURE
ELEVENTH ALASKA LEGISLATURE
TWELFTH ALASKA LEGISLATURE
THIRTEENTH ALASKA LEGISLATURE
FOURTEENTH ALASKA LEGISLATURE



SENATOR TIM KELLY

SENATE RULES CHAIRMAN

KEY POINTS FOR REVISIONS/AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 46, ALASKA STATUTES:

1. STATE POLICY: Section 46.03.010 "Declaration of Policy" provides overall guidance and authority for actions by the State of Alaska in improving and enhancing water quality.
2. Sen. Tim Kelly is offering revisions and amendments to Title 46, Alaska Statutes, that will enable the Department of Environmental Conservation to work with, assist and provide funding to local governments in Alaska in our efforts to enhance the quality of our surface and subsurface waters.
3. It is totally unacceptable that waters within the Great Land we now have polluted streams, rivers and lakes. State and local government, and all concerned people of our state must make correcting this situation a high priority. As custodians of our natural environment we owe it to ourselves and to our children to maintain the waters of this state in as high quality condition as reasonably possible.
4. For several years there has been in effect a program within DEC that was popularly referred to as the 50/50 match program. This program provided state grants to local governments for the purpose of constructing water and sewer systems and solid waste facilities. Sen. Kelly is proposing that this current program (46.03.030 Grants) be expanded to include grant funding for surface and subsurface water quality enhancement.
5. Sen. Kelly believes that expanding the current program is preferable to instituting a new program for the following reasons:
 - a. The current 50/50 match program has been quite successful in the past and it is well accepted and even praised by both state and local officials.
 - b. The program is cost effective.
 - c. The program works.
 - d. This program encourages local participation and responsibility regarding water quality enhancement.
 - e. This is a long range solution, a comprehensive program that will enable state and local governments to make a continuing effort to enhance our water quality throughout the state.
 - f. State funds can go twice as far when they are combined with matching funds from local governments. We get twice the "bang for the buck".

- g. This amendment broadens the scope of the current program and makes it more comprehensive. The program becomes a total water resource act.
- h. By expanding the current program administrative cost are held to a minimum. No new state personnel positions will be required to administer this program. There already exists within DEC a municipal grants section, and this section will be able to carryout the expanded mission of Title 46. No new bureaucracy!
- i. This will be a statewide program that will enable DEC to allocate scarce resources on a logical and rational priority basis.
- j. This program, to a large degree, will de-politicize the regional allocation of resources.
- k. These revisions/amendments have the support of DEC and the Municipality of Anchorage.
- l. For the past couple of years this grant program has not recieved adequate funding. Sen. Kelly will work to fund this program at a reasonable level. DEC would like to see 15 to 20 million per year allocated to this program. Keep in mind that this will be funding, statewide, domestic water systems, sewer systems, solid waste facilities and now water quality enhancement.
- m. It is very important that we get our residents off of on site septic systems and hooked into municipal sewer systems as soon as possible so our ground water does not become saturated beyond the point that it can naturally handle. By fully funding this program we will be able to make progress in this regard.

STATE OF ALASKA 1986 LEGISLATIVE SESSION FISCAL NOTE

Revision Date : _____

REQUEST

Bill/Resolution No. : SB 324
 Title : Act relating to grants for water quality enhancement programs;
Kelly, Abood, Faiks, Sturqulewski,
 Sponsor : Josephson, & V. Fischer
 Requestor : _____
 Date of Request : _____

FISCAL DETAIL

Agency Affected : _____
 BRU : _____

 Components : _____

EXPENDITURES/REVENUES : (Thousands of Dollars)

OPERATING	FY 86	FY 87	FY 88	FY 89	FY 90	FY 91
PERSONAL SERVICES						
TRAVEL						
CONTRACTUAL						
SUPPLIES						
EQUIPMENT						
LAND & STRUCTURES						
GRANTS, CLAIMS						
MISCELLANEOUS						
TOTAL OPERATING	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-

CAPITAL						
---------	--	--	--	--	--	--

REVENUE						
---------	--	--	--	--	--	--

FUNDING : (Thousands of Dollars)

GENERAL FUND						
FEDERAL FUNDS						
OTHER						
TOTAL						

POSITIONS :

FULL-TIME	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
PART-TIME	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
TEMPORARY	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-

ANALYSIS : Attach a separate page if necessary

Prepared by : Gary Hayden, Director
 Division : Facility Construction & Operation

Phone : 465-2610
 Date : 2/04/86

Approved by Commissioner : [Signature]
 Agency : Department of Environmental Conservation

Date : 2/4/86

Distribution (by Agency preparing fiscal note) :

- Legislative Finance
- Legislative Sponsor
- Requestor
- Office of Management and Budget
- Impacted Agency(ies)

STATE OF ALASKA 1986 LEGISLATIVE SESSION FISCAL NOTE

Revision Date : _____

REQUEST

Bill/Resolution No. : HB 461
 Title : Act relating to grants for water quality enhancement programs;
Pearce, Gruenberg, Uehling, Boucher,
 Sponsor : Furnace, Hanley, Martin, Jenkins
 Requestor : _____
 Date of Request : _____

FISCAL DETAIL

Agency Affected : _____
 BRU : _____

 Components : _____

EXPENDITURES/REVENUES : (Thousands of Dollars)

OPERATING	FY 86	FY 87	FY 88	FY 89	FY 90	FY 91
PERSONAL SERVICES						
TRAVEL						
CONTRACTUAL						
SUPPLIES						
EQUIPMENT						
LAND & STRUCTURES						
GRANTS, CLAIMS						
MISCELLANEOUS						
TOTAL OPERATING	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-

CAPITAL						
---------	--	--	--	--	--	--

REVENUE						
---------	--	--	--	--	--	--

FUNDING : (Thousands of Dollars)

GENERAL FUND						
FEDERAL FUNDS						
OTHER						
TOTAL						

POSITIONS :

FULL-TIME	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
PART-TIME	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
TEMPORARY						

ANALYSIS : Attach a separate page if necessary

Prepared by : Gary Hayden, Director
 Division : Facility Construction & Operation

Phone : 465-2610
 Date : 2/04/86

Approved by Commissioner : *Bill R...*
 Agency : Department of Environmental Conservation

Date : 2/4/86

Distribution (by Agency preparing fiscal note) :

- Legislative Finance
- Legislative Sponsor
- Requestor
- Office of Management and Budget
- Impacted Agency(ies)



RECORDS CERTIFICATION



I, the undersigned, an employee of the State of Alaska, do hereby certify that the microfilm images on this microform are accurate reproductions of the original records of the State of Alaska as accumulated during the regular course of business, and that it is the established policy and practice of this State to microfilm its records and to dispose of the original records after microfilm reproductions have been made.

James O. Smith
Signature of Camera Operator

10/31/89
Date

S B

z z z



Official Business

Alaska State Legislature
Senate

Committee on
Community and Regional Affairs

Senator Edna DeVries, Chairman
Members:
Senator Ferguson, Vice Chairman
Senator Coghill
Senator Sturgulewski
Senator V. Fischer

Pouch V
Juneau, Alaska 99811

March 19, 1986

TO: Steve White
Senator Faiks' Office

FROM: Trudie Alford
Senator DeVries' Office

SUBJECT: SB 332 Eliminating Municipal
immunity from liability in certain
actions involving private property

This confirms our phone conversation this morning when you told me that Senator Faiks wants the subject bill held until she requests that it be scheduled for hearing.

The letter with attachment, which I mentioned to you, postmarked 3/12/86, from Vince Muerlott is enclosed.

Encl: Cy of ltr

POSTMARKED

3 12-86

Dear Senator: DE VRIES

We urge you to defeat Senate Bill 332: "An act eliminating Municipal immunity from liability in certain actions involving private property".

This Bill would ammend the current Alaska Statute 09.65.070(d), which provides municipalities immunity from certain suits brought against them and their agents, officers, and employees.

If passed, this Bill would allow action for damages against municipalities and their inspectors for the following:

1. Failure to inspect for violations of applicable codes, ordinances, statutes, and regulations.
2. Failure to detect such violations in the course of inspections.
3. Failure to abate such violations or other hazards to health or safety discovered on property inspected.

We see this Bill as an attempt to transfer responsibility for safe conscientious work by the private sector to municipalities. This Bill would open the door for lawsuits against municipalities for many kinds of deficiencies that they cannot effectively detect or abate, once found.

If the immunity is removed (as required by Senate Bill 332), most communities may be forced to abolish regulatory divisions that now currently exist to protect life, health, and safety.

The regulatory divisions now employed by municipalities do not have the resources or manpower to adequately police all construction and service activities to the extent that Senate Bill 332 would require. Placing liability on regulatory divisions for work done by private contractors and citizens does not make sense.

The passage of Senate Bill 332 will most likely result in either of two scenarios:

- A. Unmanageable increases in personnel and red tape procedures by regulatory divisions in attempt to avoid any violations that would give rise to hazards.
- B. The termination of regulation enforcement divisions to avoid excessive liability that municipalities and their enforcment agents would be subjected to.

Perhaps a few examples can illustrate our point more fully.

EXAMPLE #1:

A contractor performs work under a permit on a house but never calls for a required inspection. His work has a code violation that later causes an occupant ("Joe") death. "Joe" and his wife had earlier been told by the appropriate regulatory division that the inspection would be made if such work were to be done under the permit.

RESULT #1: The contractor is at fault for the code violation and for not calling for the required inspection. With Senate Bill 332 in force you can bet that the Attorney seeking damages due to the death of "Joe" will now consider the municipality liable.

EXAMPLE #2:

A competent conscientious inspector misses a code violation during an extensive inspection because a small portion of the work was partially concealed. This violation later causes a serious fire.

RESULT #2: The contractor is at fault for the code violation but the inspector could possibly have caught the violation. Again the municipality will most likely be held liable.

EXAMPLE #3:

An inspector finds a potentially dangerous code violation during an inspection and issues a correction notice to the contractor. The contractor is reminded of the correction required 2-weeks later, but one week after that the violation causes a costly building failure.

RESULT #3: The contractor is at fault for the violation and dragging his feet on the correction. However, the municipality could be held liable for the failure to abate the violation even though they tried. An attorney could easily argue after the fact that the municipality did not act quickly and decisively enough.

The examples listed may show that with Senate Bill 332 in effect regulatory divisions may be required to adopt "gestapo type" tactics to hunt down and ensure immediate correction of violations or disband altogether in order to avoid excessive liability.

We have found that the current statutes encourage reasonable inspection efforts to discover and correct health and safety hazards. We ask that you review this Bill carefully and see that Senate Bill 332 will not be in the best interest of the Municipalities or the General Public.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

SIGNATURE

NAME & ADDRESS

SIGNATURE	NAME & ADDRESS
<i>Vince Mearlotti</i>	VINCE MEARLOTT 584 E. SLATER DR, FBKS, 99701
<i>Jeanne Marks</i>	3282 Adams FBKS AK 99709 JEANNE MARKS
<i>Nancy DeLeon</i>	1023 Dilmore Street, Fairbanks, Alaska 99701 NANCY DeLeon
<i>Cathy Hale</i>	1028 Dogwood #504 Fairbanks AK 99709 Cathy Hale
<i>Mary P. Sirock</i>	311 Wedgwood #38C Fairbanks AK 99701 Mary Sirock
<i>Ann Molwitz</i>	PO Box 83058, Fairbanks, AK 99708
<i>Carol Linkswiler</i>	Carol Linkswiler, PO Box 82038, College, AK 99708
<i>Jeanie Watts</i>	Jeanie Watts, 444 McKinley View Dr., Fairbanks, AK 99701
<i>Pat Mullen</i>	James M. Mullen, 410 Dunkel St., FBKS, AK 99701
<i>Kaye Schenborn</i>	KAYE Schenborn, 307 INA ST, FBKS 99701
<i>Eric J. Mohrman</i>	Eric J. Mohrman, PO Box 83688, FBKS, AK 99708
<i>Charles P. Seannet</i>	Charles P. Seannet 582 Slater Dr, FBKS, AK 99701
<i>Jerry A. Burgess</i>	JERRY A. Burgess 705 SLATER DR. FBKS, AK 99701
<i>Larry R. Long</i>	LARRY R. LONG 326 BARANOF FBKS AK 99701
<i>Clement M. Closter</i>	CLEMENT M. CLOSTER 1163 LINDA LOUISE LANE FAIRBANKS ALASKA 99712

The undersigned are in agreement with the letter attached urging you to defeat Senate Bill 332 or similar bill:

SIGNATURE

NAME/ADDRESS

<i>S. J. Shuttleworth</i>	STEVEN J. SHUTTLEWORTH 1701 2 nd Ave #19 FAIRBANKS AK
<i>J. H. Little</i>	JAMES H. LITTLE 104 MADRID DRIVE FAIRBANKS, AK
<i>Bill Hao</i>	BILL HAO, PO BOX 82310, FAIRBANKS AK 99708

Blank lined area for additional signatures and addresses.

Alaska State Legislature

CO-CHAIRMAN
FINANCE COMMITTEE

907-465-3740

JAN FAIKS
POUCH V
CAPITOL BUILDING
JUNEAU ALASKA 99811


Senate

February 18, 1986

FEB 19 RECD

MEMORANDUM

TO: Senator Edna DeVries, Chairman
Senate Community and Regional Affairs Committee

FROM: Senator Jan Faiks 

SUBJECT: Scheduling of Senate Bill 332 and House Bill 380

Until further notice, please do not schedule for hearing Senate Bill 332, an Act eliminating municipal immunity from liability in certain actions involving private property.

However, I would appreciate your scheduling House Bill 380, an Act relating to public utility water and sewer service extensions. Representative Szymanski and I have worked together on this bill, and it addresses a problem which faces many of my constituents.

Thank you.

OUT OF SESSION

1024 WEST SIXTH AVENUE, SUITE 302 ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501 907-274-6611

*
* DELIVER TO: JFOM *
* *
* *
* ORIGINAL *
* SENT: 01/31/86 TIME: 15:11 * 2 *
* FROM: LIOMAT *
* SUBJECT: FOMK112 *
* PRINT DATE: 01/31/86 TIME: 15:41 *
* *

*****FOMK112 - 1/31/86

TO: SENATOR DEVRIES
FR: ELSIE O'BRYAN
P O BOX 27
HOUSTON 99694
PH: 892-6869

*Send Elsie info
when I get it*

RE: SB 332

AS, YOU SUGGESTED I HAVE REVIEWED SB 332 AND FIND IT RATHER DIFFICULT TO UNDERSTAND THE INTENT. HOW DOES THE BILL ADDRESS LIABILITY OR LACK OF LIABILITY IN THE EVENT THE MUNICIPALITY DELIBERATELY DOES NOT INSPECT OR HAVE INSPECTIONS DONE ESPECIALLY CONSIDERING THE FAULTY INSPECTIONS COULD RESULT IN LIABILITY. WOULD THIS ENCOURAGE FAULTY CONSTRUCTION FOR FEAR OF BEING CHARGED FOR FAULTY INSPECTIONS?

*
* DELIVER TO: JPOM *
* *
* *
* ORIGINAL *
* SENT: 01/31/86 TIME: 15:11 * 2 *
* FROM: LIOMAT *
* SUBJECT: POMK112 *
* PRINT DATE: 01/31/86 TIME: 15:41 *
* *

*****POMK112 - 1/31/86

TO: SENATOR DEVRIE
FR: ELSIE O'BRYAN
P O BOX 27
HOUSTON 99694
PH: 892-6869

RE: SB 332

*Send Elsie info
when I get it*

AS, YOU SUGGESTED I HAVE REVIEWED SB 332 AND FIND IT RATHER DIFFICULT TO UNDERSTAND THE INTENT. HOW DOES THE BILL ADDRESS LIABILITY OR LACK OF LIABILITY IN THE EVENT THE MUNICIPALITY DELIBERATELY DOES NOT INSPECT OR HAVE INSPECTIONS DONE ESPECIALLY CONSIDERING THE FAULTY INSPECTIONS COULD RESULT IN LIABILITY. WOULD THIS ENCOURAGE FAULTY CONSTRUCTION FOR FEAR OF BEING CHARGED FOR FAULTY INSPECTIONS?



City and Borough of Sitka

304 LAKE STREET. SITKA, ALASKA. 99835

January 16, 1986

Alaska State Legislature
Richard Eliason, Senator
Pouch V
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Re: Senate Bill #332

Dear Dick,


I have been provided with a copy of Senate Bill No. 332 eliminating municipal immunity from liability in certain actions involving private property. This bill causes me great concern. It is not only ill-conceived but ill-timed. At this time municipalities are having great difficulty in obtaining any type of liability insurance and even when it is available, it comes at great cost. Many municipalities are now uninsured.

This bill would, in effect, make the municipality an insurer for the contractor and the property owner in the construction of the building. It is and should be the responsibility of the owner and contractor to construct a safe building and they should be liable for any deficiencies in the construction of that building. The municipality in inspecting the building is merely performing a service for the public, the owner and contractor. To place liability upon the municipality for failure to discover deficiencies put there by the owner and contractor is not only unfair but would greatly increase risk of lawsuit to the municipality and would increase the cost of liability insurance to the municipality astronomically.

It should be noted that the probable effect of this bill will be to force municipalities out of the building inspection field since the one way to avoid liability altogether is not to inspect. Senate Bill 332, if passed, will probably lead to a wholesale repeal of all municipal building codes since those building codes include an inspection requirement. This situation will either lead to the State having to provide this service or to buildings being built without any inspection or standards whatsoever. This can hardly be a result to be desired by the State Legislation.

Thank you for your consideration. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Very truly yours,


Theron J. Cole
Municipal Attorney



City and Borough of Sitka

304 LAKE STREET . SITKA, ALASKA . 99835

January 16, 1986

Alaska State Legislature
Richard Eliason, Senator
Pouch V
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Re: Senate Bill #332

Dear Dick,


I have been provided with a copy of Senate Bill No. 332 eliminating municipal immunity from liability in certain actions involving private property. This bill causes me great concern. It is not only ill-conceived but ill-timed. At this time municipalities are having great difficulty in obtaining any type of liability insurance and even when it is available, it comes at great cost. Many municipalities are now uninsured.

This bill would, in effect, make the municipality an insurer for the contractor and the property owner in the construction of the building. It is and should be the responsibility of the owner and contractor to construct a safe building and they should be liable for any deficiencies in the construction of that building. The municipality in inspecting the building is merely performing a service for the public, the owner and contractor. To place liability upon the municipality for failure to discover deficiencies put there by the owner and contractor is not only unfair but would greatly increase risk of lawsuit to the municipality and would increase the cost of liability insurance to the municipality astronomically.

It should be noted that the probable effect of this bill will be to force municipalities out of the building inspection field since the one way to avoid liability altogether is not to inspect. Senate Bill 332, if passed, will probably lead to a wholesale repeal of all municipal building codes since those building codes include an inspection requirement. This situation will either lead to the State having to provide this service or to buildings being built without any inspection or standards whatsoever. This can hardly be a result to be desired by the State Legislation.

Thank you for your consideration. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Very truly yours,


Theron J. Cole
Municipal Attorney



RECORDS CERTIFICATION



I, the undersigned, an employee of the State of Alaska, do hereby certify that the microfilm images on this microform are accurate reproductions of the original records of the State of Alaska as accumulated during the regular course of business, and that it is the established policy and practice of this State to microfilm its records and to dispose of the original records after microfilm reproductions have been made.

James O. Smith
Signature of Camera Operator

10/31/89
Date

S B

3 3 5

STATE OF ALASKA
THE LEGISLATURE

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS AGENCY
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE LIBRARY

POUCHY - STATE CAPITOL
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99811
907-465-3800

May, 1986

Copies of minutes listed below were originally included in this file. The minutes are available on the STAIRS date base CM 14. In order to save space copies of minutes have not been left in the files.

Jeanie Henry

Senate Community and Regional Affairs, 2/18/86, 3:36



Official Business

Alaska State Legislature

Senate

Pouch V
State Capitol
Juneau, Alaska 99811

MEMORANDUM

TO: Senator Edna DeVries, Chairman
Senate Community and Regional
Affairs Committee

FROM: Frank R. Ferguson
Alaska State Senate

DATE: February 12, 1986

SUBJ: Senate Bill 335

Your staff has requested an explanation regarding the formulation of Senate Bill 335.

The projects listed in the bill include all Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) priority projects and community projects not on DEC's list.

The projects were listed irrespective of the Governor's FY '87 proposed capital budget.

Attached is a list of Governor's water and sewer projects included on Senate Bill 335.

FRF/mjs

SANITATION PROJECTS IN GOV FY 87 CAPITAL BUD 1/21/86

ELEC DIST	TOWN	PROJECT	PRIORITY	DEC \$	Dir \$	Funding Mech
01	PETERSBURG	MILL SLOUGH SERVICE MAIN EXTENSION	2/7	114,000		MG
		SCOW BAY AREA SEWER EXTENSION	1/7	436,700		MG
		Total:		550,700		
02	CRAIG HAINES HOONAH KAKE PORT PROTECTION YAKUTAT	ST. NICHOLAS WATER	1/9		1,500,000	DIRECT
		WATER TREATMENT PLANT FLOCCULATION TANK	1/5	100,000		MG
		WATER/WASTEWATER	1/8		575,000	DIRECT
		WATER/SEWER SERVICE, REPAIRS AND MAINT	2/20		85,000	DIRECT
		PHASE II WATER	1/1	220,000		VSW
		WATER AND SEWER PROJECTS	2/5		13,000	DIRECT
Total:		320,000	2,173,000			
03	PORT ALEXANDER SITKA	WATER STORAGE TANK		60,000		VSW
		WATER LINE TO SITKA AIRPORT	4/4	460,000		MG
		Total:		520,000	0	
04	JUNEAU	MENDENHALL VALLEY TREATMENT PLANT EXP. S EG III & IV	2/11	902,400		MG
		COMMUNITY WIDE WATER SYSTEM COMPLETION	1/11	5,401,000		MG
		Total:		6,303,400	0	
05	HOMER SELDOVIA SOLDOTNA	EAST HILL RD. SEWER EXPANSION	14/19	550,000		MG
		WASTEWATER TREATMENT STUDY	1/5	48,000		VSW
		NEW WATER TANK, KALIFONSKY BEACH RD.	2/11	1,625,000		MG
Total:		2,223,000	0			
06	VALDEZ	FIDALGO STREET SOUTH SPIT WATER IMPROVEM ENTS	02	170,000		MG
		Total:		170,000	0	
07	ANCHORAGE	EKLUTNA WATER AND SEWER PROJECTS	4/11	5,000,000	16,000,000	DIRECT MG
		Total:		5,000,000	16,000,000	
16	MATANUSKA-SUSITNA BOROUGH TALKEETNA WASILLA	HOUSTON SEPTAGE FACILITY		250,000		MG
		VSW SEWER SYSTEM	8/10	1,000,000		VSW
		E. WASILLA WATER AND SEWER EXTENSIONS	01	600,000		MG
Total:		1,850,000	0			
17	CANTWELL HEALY LAKE TAZLINA VILLAGE	SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL SITE	1/1	100,000		VSW
		COMMUNITY WATERING POINT		83,000		VSW
		COMMUNITY WELL	2/3	24,000		VSW

SANITATION PROJECTS IN GOV FY 87 CAPITAL BUD 1/21/86

ELEC DIST	TOWN	PROJECT	PRIORITY	DEC \$	Dir \$	Funding Mech
				Total:	287,000	0
18	NORTH POLE	NW SEWER INTERCEPTOR AND HIGHWAY PARK SEWER	1/7		1,800,000	DIRECT
				Total:	0	1,800,000
19	CIRCLE	COMMUNITY WELL		50,000		VSW
				Total:	50,000	0
20	FAIRBANKS	VAN HORN AREA SEWER REHAB	1/29		1,800,000	DIRECT
		E SIDE WOODSTAVE WATER MAIN REPLACEMENT	3/29		1,290,000	DIRECT
				Total:	0	3,090,000
22	NORTH SLOPE BOROUGH	ANAKTUVUK PASS LANDFILL	1/4	500,000		MG
		ATQASUK LANDFILL AND ACCESS ROAD	1/4	500,000		MG
		NUIGSUT HONEYBUCKET DISPOSAL LAGOON	1/4	500,000		MG
	SELAWIK	ENGINEERING FEASIBILITY STUDY/DUMP RELOCATION		161,000		VSW
				Total:	1,661,000	0
24	CHUATHBALUK	SEWERAGE/SOLID WASTE SITE	1/7	110,000		VSW
	CROOKED CREEK	SEWER AND WATER FACILITY	1/1	140,500		VSW
	KALSKAG	WATERING POINT AND TREATMENT		300,000		VSW
	KOYUKUK	WATER PLANT IMPROVEMENTS	1/4	35,000		VSW
	LINE VILLAGE	WATERING POINT AND WASTE TREATMENT		365,000		VSW
	MULATO	WATER AND SEWER	1/5		1,500,000	DIRECT
	SHAGELUK	VILLAGE SAFE WATER PROJECT		75,000		VSW
	ST. MARY'S	WATER/SEWER PHASE II YUPIK RD	1/2	350,000		MG
	TELIDA	ENGINEERING FEASIBILITY STUDY		15,000		VSW
				Total:	1,398,500	1,500,000
25	AKIAKCHAK	SOLID WASTE SYSTEM	1/8	250,500		VSW
	AMAUTLUAK	WASHETERIA REHAB	1/3	371,000		VSW
	KASIELUK	WASHETERIA IMPROVEMENTS	2/10	159,000		VSW
	KWETHLUK	ENGINEERING FEASIBILITY STUDY		10,000		VSW
	NAPAKIAK	ENGINEERING FEASIBILITY STUDY		10,000		VSW
	TUNUNAK	RELOCATION OF DUMP SITE	2/6	362,000		VSW
				Total:	1,171,300	0
26	DILLINGHAM	SEWERAGE FACILITIES	1/10	950,000		MG
	IGUSHIK	COMMUNITY WELL		50,000		VSW
	LEWIS POINT	COMMUNITY WELL		55,000		VSW
	NELSON LAGOON	ENGINEERING FEASIBILITY STUDY		15,000		VSW
	TOGIAK	WATER, SEWER AND SOLID WASTE		50,000		VSW
	UNALASKA	WATER SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS	1/6		102,600	DIRECT

SANITATION PROJECTS IN GOV FY 87 CAPITAL BUD 1/21/86

ELEC DIST	TOWN	PROJECT	PRIORITY	DEC \$	Dir \$	Funding Mech
				Total:	1,120,000	102,600
27	CHIGNIK	CENTRAL WATER SYSTEM FOR SERVICE AREA #2	02	82,000		VSW
	PORT LIONS	TOWNSITE WATER AND SEWER	2/2	300,000		MG
				Total:	382,000	0
30	ADEC -- VILLAGE SAFE WATER	CIP ADMINISTRATIVE RECEIPTS		300,000		VSW
	ADEC -- MUNICIPAL GRANTS SECTION	CIP ADMINISTRATIVE RECEIPTS		400,000		MG
				Total:	700,000	0
				Total:	23,625,900	24,655,600

STATE OF ALASKA 1986 LEGISLATIVE SESSION
FISCAL NOTE

Revision Date: _____

REQUEST
Bill/Resolution No: SB 335
Title: \$166,001,000 Water, Sewer, & Solid Waste General Obligation Bonds
Sponsor: Ferguson
Requestor: Senate C & RA
Date of Request: February 11, 1986

FISCAL DETAIL
Agency Affected: State Bond Committee
BRU: _____
Components: _____

EXPENDITURES/REVENUES: (Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 86	FY 87	FY 88	FY 89	FY 90	FY 91
OPERATING						
PERSONAL SERVICES	-	-	-	-	-	-
TRAVEL	-	-	-	-	-	-
CONTRACTUAL	-	-	-	-	-	-
SUPPLIES	-	-	-	-	-	-
EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
LANDS & STRUCTURES	-	-	-	-	-	-
GRANTS, CLAIMS	-	-	-	-	-	-
MISCELLANEOUS	-	5,920	27,943	26,892	25,785	24,679
TOTAL OPERATING	-	5,920	27,943	26,892	25,785	24,679
CAPITAL	-	-	-	-	-	-
REVENUE	-	-	-	-	-	-

FUNDING: (Thousands of Dollars)

GENERAL FUND	-	5,920	27,943	26,892	25,785	24,679
FEDERAL FUNDS	-	-	-	-	-	-
OTHER	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	5,920	27,943	26,892	25,785	24,679

POSITIONS:

FULL-TIME	-	-	-	-	-	-
PART-TIME	-	-	-	-	-	-
TEMPORARY	-	-	-	-	-	-

ANALYSIS: Debt service on \$166,001,000 of bonds using 12-27-86 interest rates on ten year bonds with level principal. Attached Tables I and II compare debt service to unrestricted revenues without and with SB 335, respectively.

Prepared By: Milt Barker *MB*
 Division: Treasury
 Approved by Commissioner: *Mary G. Hurdale*
 Agency: Department of Revenue

Phone: 465-2350
 Date: February 12, 1986
 Date: 2/12/86

Distribution (by Agency preparing fiscal note):

- Legislative Finance
- Legislative Sponsor
- Requestor
- Office of Management and Budget
- Impacted Agency(ies)

Table II

State Debt Service Burden
in \$ Millions and as a % of Unrestricted Revenues ^{1/}
Including Debt Service on \$166 Million GOB's
in Columns 1, 3, 4, and 5

Fiscal Year	1		2		3		4		5	
	Existing Debt Service and Lease Obligations		Existing School Debt Reimbursement		Total Existing Debt Service (1 & 2)		Minimum Under Existing Law		Maximum Under HB 520	
86	\$178	6.1%	\$105	3.6%	\$283	9.7%	\$283	9.7%	\$283	9.7%
87	174	7.2	109	4.5	283	11.7	318	13.1	318	13.1
88	189	9.2	100	4.8	289	14.0	341	16.5	341	16.5
89	177	9.3	109	5.7	287	15.1	340	17.8	350	18.3
90	161	8.9	90	5.0	251	13.9	302	16.7	312	17.3
91	135	8.0	78	4.6	213	12.6	263	15.6	273	16.2
92	106	6.2	72	4.2	178	10.4	225	13.2	235	13.8
93	95	5.6	63	3.7	158	9.3	204	12.0	214	12.6
94	65	4.1	56	3.6	121	7.7	164	10.6	174	11.1
95	52	3.4	47	3.1	99	6.5	139	9.1	149	9.8
96	47	3.4	33	2.4	80	5.8	119	8.6	129	9.3
97	42	2.8	16	1.1	58	3.9	75	5.1	85	5.8
98	21	1.5	14	1.0	35	2.5	42	3.0	52	3.7
99	16	1.1	14	1.0	30	2.3	37	2.6	47	3.3
00	9	.7	12	.9	21	1.6	27	2.1	37	2.9

^{1/} Unrestricted revenues are September 1985 30th percentile estimates.

Table I
 State Debt Service Burden
 in \$ Millions and as a % of Unrestricted Revenues ^{1/}

Fiscal Year	1		2		3		4		5	
	Existing Debt Service and Lease Obligations		Existing School Debt Reimbursement		Total Existing Debt Service (1 & 2)		Minimum Under Existing Law		Maximum Under HB 520	
86	\$178	6.1%	\$105	3.6%	\$283	9.7%	\$283	9.7%	\$283	9.7%
87	168	7.0	109	4.5	277	11.5	312	12.9	312	12.9
88	161	7.8	100	4.8	261	12.6	313	15.1	313	15.1
89	150	7.9	109	5.7	259	13.6	313	16.4	323	16.9
90	135	7.5	90	5.0	225	12.5	276	15.3	286	15.9
91	110	6.5	78	4.6	188	11.1	238	14.1	248	14.7
92	82	4.8	72	4.2	154	9.0	201	11.8	211	12.4
93	73	4.3	63	3.7	136	8.0	182	10.7	192	11.3
94	44	2.8	56	3.6	100	6.4	143	9.2	153	9.8
95	32	2.1	47	3.1	79	5.2	119	7.8	129	8.5
96	28	2.0	33	2.4	61	4.4	100	7.2	110	7.9
97	24	1.6	16	1.1	40	2.7	57	3.9	67	4.6
98	21	1.5	14	1.0	35	2.5	42	3.0	52	3.7
99	16	1.1	14	1.0	30	2.3	37	2.6	47	3.3
00	9	.7	12	.9	21	1.6	27	2.1	37	2.9

^{1/} Unrestricted revenues are September 1985 30th percentile estimates.

Column Key

1. Debt service on State general obligation bonds, University of Alaska revenue bonds, ASHA lease revenue bonds, and lease payments on Seward Student Service Center and Correctional Center.
2. 80%, 90%, or 100% State reimbursement of debt service paid by municipalities on school debt outstanding as of December 31, 1985.
3. Total of columns 1 and 2.
4. Column 3 plus lease payments on Anchorage Court Building plus State reimbursement on \$312.5 million of authorized but unissued school debt and \$31.4 million of school debt to be authorized by the voters in January and March of 1986. Of this \$343.9 million new school debt, \$230.2 million is scheduled for issuance in FY 86. Reimbursement of school debt is 80% of current debt service payments on 10 year debt with level principal payments.
5. Column 4 plus maximum additional State reimbursement of \$10 million per year for school debt authorized after March 31, 1986. Reimbursement of school debt under this cap would be 100% of principal paid two years prior on 10 year debt with level principal payments.

Prepared by: Department of Revenue
January 31, 1986

**STATE OF ALASKA 1986 LEGISLATIVE SESSION
FISCAL NOTE**

Revision Date : _____

REQUEST

Bill/Resolution No. : SB 335
Title : Water & Sewer Bond Bill

Sponsor : _____
Requestor : _____
Date of Request : _____

FISCAL DETAIL

Agency Affected : Dept. of Environmental Conserv
BRU : Facility Construction & Operation

Components : CIP

EXPENDITURES/REVENUES : (Thousands of Dollars)

OPERATING	FY 86	FY 87	FY 88	FY 89	FY 90	FY 91
PERSONAL SERVICES		431.2	431.2	431.2	431.2	431.2
TRAVEL		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
CONTRACTUAL		138.0	138.0	138.0	138.0	138.0
SUPPLIES		4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1
EQUIPMENT		5.9	5.9	5.9	5.9	5.9
LAND & STRUCTURES		---	---	---	---	---
GRANTS, CLAIMS						
MISCELLANEOUS						
TOTAL OPERATING		679.2	679.2	679.2	679.2	679.2

CAPITAL		679.2	679.2	679.2	679.2	679.2
----------------	--	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

REVENUE		---	---	---	---	---
----------------	--	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

FUNDING : (Thousands of Dollars)

GENERAL FUND						
FEDERAL FUNDS						
OTHER CIP		679.2	679.2	679.2	679.2	679.2
TOTAL						

POSITIONS :

FULL-TIME		8	8	8	8	8
PART-TIME		1	1	1	1	1
TEMPORARY						

ANALYSIS : Attach a separate page if necessary

DEC has administered a bond funded grant program for this type of project since 1970. It is assumed that a similar type of staff would be needed. It is also assumed the program would not start until mid FY87 and all VSW type projects could be completed in three construction seasons and part of FY91 to close out the projects.

Prepared by : Gary Hayden Phone : 465-2610
Division : Facility Construction & Operation Date : 2-17-86

Approved by Commissioner : Bill Ross Date : 2-18-86

Agency : _____

Distribution (by Agency preparing fiscal note) :

- Legislative Finance
- Legislative Sponsor
- Requestor
- Office of Management and Budget
- Impacted Agency(ies)

Position Title Environmental Engineer III			No. of Positions 2	Range/Step 19A	Barg. Unit GGU	Gov.	Approv.	Disapp.
Time Status	Staff Months 24	RP Number	Location Anchorage		Election District	Leg.		
Type of Expenditure			Justification					
1		2	3					
Salary		80,064						
Benefits		24,406						
Premium Pay								
Other								
Total Personal Services			104,470					
Travel			30,800					
Contractual			30,700					
Commodities			2,000					
Equipment			3,000					
Other								
Total Cost			170,970					
Receipt Code		Funding Source						
		Federal Receipts 1002						
		G. F. Match 1003						
		General Funds 1004						
		I-A Receipts 1005						
		Program Receipts 1028						
		CIP Receipts 1061		170,970				
		Other						
For B&M Use Only Key Number _____								

**Request For
New Position**

Agency Environmental Conservation
 BRU Facility Construction & Operation
 Component CIP Overhead Positions

Page 2 of 2
 Revised Date 2-17-86

FY 87

Advised Nenana City

Ojc -- 2/24/86

That 335 was being held in committee at request of Bill sponsor, Sen. Ferguson.
2 Steve Bainbridge in Anchorage.

-y-

* DELIVER TO. JFOM
* ORIGINAL
* SENT: 02/17/86 TIME: 13:25
* FROM: ANNIE NEUBAUER
* SUBJECT: FOM/FAIRBANKS
* PRINT DATE: 02/17/86 TIME: 13:25

TO: SENATOR DEVRIES

FROM: STEVE BAINBRIDGE, CITY ENGINEER,
CITY OF NENANA, NENANA 99760

PHONE: 832-5441

RE: SB335 GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS WATER/SEWER

THE CITY OF NENANA SUPPORTS SB335. AS "GRANTS TO MUNICIPALITIES" ARE FAST DISAPPEARING, AND SMALL COMMUNITIES ARE VERY LIMITED AS TO THEIR BONDED INDEBTEDNESS, A STATE BOND ISSUE IS ONE OF THE FEW REMAINING VEHICLES AVAILABLE TO FUND CONSTRUCTION OF MUCH NEEDED SANITATION FACILITIES. YOUR FAVORABLE CONSIDERATION OF SB335 IS GREATLY APPRECIATED.

C&RA

Feb 18th

Johnson for Tim Kelly
Mark Kelly on SB 324 - in support

Bill Ross Supports SB 324

Campbell Creek so bad - had to cancel Campbell Co Class.
\$110,000 from Gov
200,000 from City to test purity
of rivers

Anc passed \$10 mil bond issue for
water clean-up

Coghull - if safe water - b' n' be spending
on cleaning up lakes

Ross - No, we would still deal w/ funda-
mentals 1st.

Ferg

335

It is my understanding
that no general obligation bond bill is
going to pass the Senate this year -
therefore don't want to waste
the Commissioner's time, or

the Committee's time

Fisher SB 448 home rule powers to 2nd class cities

(ask DC&RA to suggest way to handle dissolution - then Coordinate review)

With this bill (SB448) also hear proposal from DC&RA on how to handle dissolution.

Coghill

6 of 13 / resolution is a hearing to be put on record what Leg 6 is on detachment of land areas, and what the Leg responsibility is for this type of action.

Do have reservation about DC&RA getting into this - 6 LBC of this and not the Dept.

of a message to the Constitution stay on watersheds in drawing lines.

Sen Ferguson I was Co. / v impartial and not vote until the Senate floor, but--
a no. of people in Kotzebue who don't want a Boro don't v b. \$ / o Taxation.

Around 1992 Assembly for us, boro (leg) will meet / o us for unorganized boro. Our us -- b by the Leg e -- by our people. Therefore we need a boro.

Ferguson, s d may not like the resolution but m b s to.

Fischer

Would not want to introduce legislation. Dialog was very shrill, but tempers have cooled. Essentially NS Boro is accepting the detachment at this time. If we do this, we will look like we support the resolution.

Stuy

I have concerns about introducing the resolution.
Oppor to see another Boro is good.

4

Coghill - I agree, we need a clear-cut record.
I want to put it on record that
if the NS Boro sues the State, the Leg will not be
responsible for paying..

Ferguson - If I were asked, I would say that they
save their money on legal fees.

Delrais - Need to put some things on record
by voting res. up or down -
because other areas want to
detach -- Lake Louise, Eagle River, Salcha.

V Fischer - What you do here doesn't affect other detachments.

COM. adjourned 4:17p