

# MUNICIPALITY OF ANCHORAGE



#### ASSEMBLY MEMORANDUM

No. AM \_\_\_\_\_-2024

Meeting Date: December 17, 2024

| T                                      |
|--|
| 2                                      |
| 2<br>3                                 |
| 4                                      |
| 5<br>6<br>7                            |
| 6                                      |
| 7                                      |
| 8                                      |
| 9                                      |
| 10                                     |
| 11                                     |
| 12                                     |
| 13                                     |
| 11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15             |
| 15                                     |
| 16<br>17                               |
| 17                                     |
| 18                                     |
| 19                                     |
| 20                                     |
| 21                                     |
| 22                                     |
| 23                                     |
| 18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 |
|  |

25 26

27

28

29 30

31

32

33

34

35

36 37

1

From: Assembly Member Brawley

AO 2024-105 (S-4) - AN ORDINANCE OF THE ANCHORAGE Subject: MUNICIPAL ASSEMBLY PROPOSING A TAX REVENUE DIVERSIFICATION MEASURE TO BE SUBMITTED TO THE QUALIFIED VOTERS OF THE MUNICIPALITY THAT WOULD ENACT A SALES AND USE TAX OF THREE PERCENT (3%) IN THE AGGREGATE ON THE SALE OF GOODS AND SERVICES WITHIN THE MUNICIPALITY, WITH CERTAIN EXEMPTIONS, COMPRISED OF A ONE-HALF PERCENT (0.5%) TAX FOR THE SOLE PURPOSE **OF REDUCING** PROPERTY TAXES PROPORTIONATELY THROUGHOUT THE MUNICIPALITY WITHIN THE **"TAX** CAP" CALCULATION, AND A TWO AND A HALF PERCENT (2.5%) TAX OUTSIDE OF THE TAX CAP DEDICATED FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF A TRUST FUND FOR VOTER AUTHORIZED COMMUNITY NEEDS; COSTS OF ADMINISTRATION, COLLECTION AND AUDIT OF THESE SALES AND USE TAXES SHALL BE INCLUDED UNDER THE TAX CAP: AMENDING AMC CHAPTER 12.10 TO INCREASE THE BUSINESS INVENTORY PERSONAL PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION TO THE FIRST \$100,000 OF VALUE; AND PROVIDING FOR TRANSITION PROCEDURES AND EFFECTIVE DATES.

This substitute version proposes a significantly different approach to the sponsors' Project Anchorage proposal (AO 2024-105 and -105(S)), but also carries forward several assumptions and broad goals from their concept:

- The Municipality must diversify its revenue sources while considering how to balance burdens across residents, property owners, and business enterprises comprising our tax base.
- The community desires revitalization and enhancing quality of life, and should dedicate locally-generated funding to this purpose.
- Public cultural and recreational facilities and services are important aspects of quality of life, amenities that residents expect, and also generate economic activity from both residents and visitors.
  - It is critical to the long-term success and fiscal health of the Municipality, and our public facilities and services, to ensure we adequately fund operations, maintenance, major repairs and other known needs.
- The Municipality's voters expect public funds to be spent wisely, with clear accountability and continued commitment to use new tax revenue for its intended purposes, and deliver results.
- Sales taxes require public approval, and have trade-offs: it is therefore
   important to consider what voters will support, and offer a balanced revenue
   proposal that accounts for cost of living and existing property tax burden.

1 2 Other substitute versions introduced for this item also offer alternative designs 3 using many of the same assumptions and goals. This version does not incorporate all other proposed elements, but the following items are particularly compelling: 4 5 (S) Municipal services universal hardship application, trust fund for dedicated revenue collected, Community Work Agreement (CWA) 6 7 language, certain exemptions such as feminine hygiene products and 8 nonprofit organizations. (S-1) Putting the sales tax (detailed proposal) voters as a special election 9 (S-2) Municipal programs and benefits Charter amendment and proposal, 10 language including "community need" and "public purpose," dedications to 11 12 housing and transit, addressing business personal property (inventory) tax (S-3) Dedications to maintenance, language including "public purpose." 13 removes property tax relief. 14 15 Approach and Priorities in This Version: A Community Needs Sales Tax 16 17 The following policy approach and priorities guided creating this version: 18 19 20 1. Focus on community needs, and prioritize what we need over what we want. These are not mutually exclusive, but focusing new revenue into our 21 housing, infrastructure, existing public facilities and services, while still 22 imagining new possibilities, helps achieve the goal of investing in ourselves. 23 2. Elevate funds for dedicated community needs above property tax relief. 24 25 This proposal does not remove replacement of existing property tax revenue under the cap, but de-prioritizes it and shifts all administration 26 27 costs to be fully within the tax cap. 3. Maintain and keep improving what we have. This applies not only to public 28 29 facilities, like libraries, but also to our housing stock, commercial properties that mean growth opportunities for small businesses, and civic and 30 31 recreational amenities that people expect in thriving communities. 32 4. Use new dedicated funding for necessary and practical needs that are not economic (will not be addressed by the market). The proposed uses for the 33 34 funds address broad needs: housing, repair of existing facilities, public 35 transit, and other categories. Where possible, the language narrows the focus to what will not pay for itself through the private sector: construction of 36 new affordable housing, improvements to existing affordable housing, and 37 expansion of bus routes as a match to federal funding. 38 5. Create a tax mechanism that is both stable and flexible for the long term. 39 Sunset provisions, prohibitions on using financing, and other specific design 40 choices made in the sponsors' version of the tax will make it more difficult to 41 42 administer this tax long term, and could create more volatility in property tax bills if voters fail to re-authorize the tax in a future year. Changing these 43 provisions do not change the underlying premise of the tax, and preserves 44 45 clear guardrails to protect these new public funds. 46 6. Manage administrative burden and cost for government, entities utilizing

1 project funds, and the private sector. Some design features in this proposal 2 are intended to give flexibility to future elected leaders and the public, to 3 avoid complex charter amendments in future years and allow for addressing the Municipality's needs as they evolve over time. Rather than narrowly 4 5 defining specific projects or uses of funds, this version gives multiple options and contemplates creation of different initiatives over time. 6 7 7. Do not attempt to define all the details in the ballot measure. The last portion of this memorandum lists proposed policy choices for a future 8 implementation ordinance, as well as possible exemptions, but does not 9 address all of these in what goes before voters. 10 8. Take the time to create the right proposal, and make space for voters to 11 consider this big question on the ballot. This proposes a special election for 12 September 2025, which allows additional time past the deadlines for the 13 14 April 1, 2025 election to continue working toward a consensus-based, redesigned version of this proposal before it goes to voters. 15 16 Policy Choices in Proposed Ballot Language 17 1. Retains the 3% overall tax rate. 18 2. Retains a split between property tax relief (i.e., general government funding 19 under the tax cap) and dedicated funds to specified purposes. It changes 20 the proportion from 2:1 to 1:5, with 0.5% to property tax relief (one-sixth or 21 22 17% of total revenue) and 2.5% to dedicated purposes, outside the tax cap (five-sixths or 83% of total revenue). 23 24 Removes the sunset provision. This means that the tax itself does not 25 expire, or require active re-authorization by voters; both property tax relief and the dedicated fund uses continue in perpetuity. Accountability to voters 26 is maintained via dedication of funds in the Charter; the opportunity to 27 28 expand, remove, or change allowed dedications remains available to voters through a future Charter amendment, which may be placed on the ballot by 29 the Assembly. 30 31 4. Proposes a different approach and clear set of options to utilize the new tax 32 funding, focused on housing production, public transit, encouraging reuse and improvements to our existing building stock, and supporting small 33 34 businesses who make physical building improvements. Recognizing the desire to re-invest in Anchorage and amenities that support quality of life, 35 funds can also be utilized for constructing new facilities as well as 36 37 improvements to existing facilities, from libraries to parks. Additionally, the fund may support operations and maintenance for public facilities, 38 39 consistent with Project Anchorage's version. 40 5. Allows for use of dedicated funds for debt service, and does not require 41 80% equity before beginning construction. 6. Excludes alcoholic beverages, marijuana products, and room rental tax 42 from sales tax, unless voters amend those separate sections of the Charter 43 to make changes to how those existing funds are already dedicated. 44 7. Removes much of the specificity about exemptions, but retains references 45 to nonprofit organizations, sales and rental of real property, fuel and 46 47 gasoline, business purchases for resale, private individual sales, and 48 moving expenses (bringing goods into the city to establish residence).

| 1  | 8. Prohibits a universal transaction cap, but allows the Assembly to set                |  |  |  |
|----|---|--|--|--|
|    |   |  |  |  |
| 2  | transaction caps for categories of some goods and services. The limit must              |  |  |  |
| 3  | be at least \$5,000.  |  |  |  |
| 4  | 9. Shifts all collection, enforcement, and audit functions to be within the cap,        |  |  |  |
|    |   |  |  |  |
| 5  | and collected from the portion used as property tax relief.                             |  |  |  |
| 6  | 10. Includes raising the exemption for business personal property tax from              |  |  |  |
| 7  | \$20,000 to \$100,000. By law the Assembly is allowed to increase this                  |  |  |  |
|    |   |  |  |  |
| 8  | exemption further by ordinance; it does not require approval of the voters.             |  |  |  |
| 9  | 11. Calls for a special election to be held September 9, 2025, with effective           |  |  |  |
| 10 | dates and implementation dates adjusted accordingly. This requires the tax              |  |  |  |
|    |   |  |  |  |
| 11 | take effect between September 1, 2026 and by June 1, 2027.                              |  |  |  |
| 12 |   |  |  |  |
| 13 | Additional Information about Proposed Community Needs (Allowed Uses)                    |  |  |  |
|    |   |  |  |  |
| 14 | The list proposed in the ballot proposition is intended to provide clear guardrails for |  |  |  |
| 15 | how these funds can be spent, while also building in flexibility to consider new        |  |  |  |
| 16 | funding programs and shift priorities in the fund over time. Because the tax itself     |  |  |  |
|    |   |  |  |  |
| 17 | does not sunset in this version and is not built around individual named projects, the  |  |  |  |
| 18 | intent is to authorize multiple possible uses of the fund, and continue refining and    |  |  |  |
| 19 | prioritizing these before (and after) implementation of the tax itself. This version    |  |  |  |
| 20 | assumes that any of the community recreation projects proposed are compatible           |  |  |  |
|    |   |  |  |  |
| 21 | with allowed uses, provided that the facility is serving the public.                    |  |  |  |
| 22 |   |  |  |  |
| 23 | It does not require returning to voters to re-authorize what has already been           |  |  |  |
|    |   |  |  |  |
| 24 | approved in the Charter, similar to how alcohol and marijuana tax dedications have      |  |  |  |
| 25 | been designed; it does, however, contemplate that in the future, voters may approve     |  |  |  |
| 26 | changes to this list by Charter amendment: this may include adding, changing, or        |  |  |  |
| 27 | removing a priority area.   |  |  |  |
|    | Tentoving a priority area.  |  |  |  |
| 28 |   |  |  |  |
| 29 | Within each authorized use of the funds, listed below, there are multiple possibilities |  |  |  |
| 30 | for addressing the community's needs: under each are ideas to explore further.          |  |  |  |
|    |   |  |  |  |
| 31 |   |  |  |  |
| 32 | 1. "Housing construction, rehabilitation and repairs, capital improvements and          |  |  |  |
| 33 | infrastructure, and investments to reduce housing cost burdens"                         |  |  |  |
| 34 |   |  |  |  |
|    |   |  |  |  |
| 35 | households below 80% AMI. There is parallel work to create tax                          |  |  |  |
| 36 | incentives for market-rate and workforce housing, but new housing                       |  |  |  |
| 37 | for low income households is not economic without direct subsidy.                       |  |  |  |
|    |   |  |  |  |
| 38 | • Capital grants or revolving loan fund for reconstruction or rehabilitation            |  |  |  |
| 39 | of existing affordable housing, such as roof replacements.                              |  |  |  |
| 40 | • ADA accessibility improvements to existing housing, such as ramps.                    |  |  |  |
| 41 |   |  |  |  |
|    |   |  |  |  |
| 42 | infrastructure systems of rental housing, mobile home parks, and                        |  |  |  |
| 43 | common interest communities (condo associations) to restore the                         |  |  |  |
| 44 | property to minimum living standard. To ensure owners are investing                     |  |  |  |
|    |   |  |  |  |
| 45 | in their own properties, at least a 50% match is required, which can                    |  |  |  |
| 46 | include leveraging other federal, state, local, and private funds.                      |  |  |  |
| 47 | • Matching water and sewer improvements for capital projects that                       |  |  |  |
| 48 | include housing, within AWWU service boundaries.  |  |  |  |
|    |   |  |  |  |
| 49 | • Improvements to mitigate cost burdens for residents could include                     |  |  |  |
|    |   |  |  |  |

| 1<br>2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13 | 2. | <ul> <li>energy efficiency investments: on-demand water heaters, solar panels, passive heating and cooling upgrades, and better insulation.</li> <li>"Improvements to real property to support small business development"</li> <li>Similar program to affordable housing revolving loan funds, or matching funds for major repairs, but focused on small businesses with a physical presence within the Municipality. This could include tenant improvements for start-up businesses, safety improvements (such as roof truss replacements), and reducing costs of doing business in storefronts and commercial properties.</li> <li>One-time funding for businesses to make improvements directly related to required licensing or other code compliance: this may include cottage food businesses, restaurants requiring food and safe service permits, licensed child care providers who must meet specific</li> </ul> |
|---|----|--|
| 14<br>15  |    | physical requirements for operation of a center, and ADA accessibility improvements that benefit customers and businesses.   |
| 16<br>17  | 3. | "Expansion of service, capital and operational improvements for public transportation"   |
| 18  |    | transportation"<br><ul> <li>Additional fixed routes, special routes serving time-limited events, or</li> </ul>   |
| 19  |    | paratransit services.  |
| 20  |    | • Higher level of route service such as route frequency, operating hours.  |
| 21  |    | <ul> <li>Capital improvements, maintenance and repair of transit facilities</li> </ul>   |
| 22<br>23  |    | including centers and transfer points, bus shelters, signage, and ADA accessibility improvements at or immediately around bus stops.   |
| 24  |    | <ul> <li>Improved communication, ticketing, and customer service offerings</li> </ul>  |
| 25  |    | intended to improve transit access and increase ridership.   |
| 26  |    | • This category overlaps with #5 below, but does not assume that transit   |
| 27<br>28  | 1  | service improvements must be tied to specific public facilities.<br>"Construction, rehabilitation and repairs, and other improvements to public  |
| 20<br>29  | 4. | facilities and civic institutions serving the public; this includes both existing  |
| 30  |    | and future municipal facilities"   |
| 31  |    | • Existing facilities (examples): Performing Arts Center, Mountain View  |
| 32  |    | Library, Animal Control Center, Town Square Park, Cuddy Park,  |
| 33  |    | <ul> <li>existing Recreation Centers, trails and related amenities.</li> <li>Potential new facilities (examples): Downtown Library, Chester Creek</li> </ul>   |
| 34<br>35  |    | <ul> <li>Potential new facilities (examples): Downtown Library, Chester Creek<br/>Sports Complex, new Health Department building including public</li> </ul>   |
| 36  |    | health clinics and other direct services. Project Anchorage's proposed   |
| 37  |    | projects would also be examples of possible new facilities.  |
| 38  | 5. | "Improvements that maintain, enhance, or increase the public's access to   |
| 39<br>40  |    | <ul> <li>and utilization of, public facilities and amenities"</li> <li>This could mean transit service changes, wayfinding or trail</li> </ul>   |
| 41  |    | connections between facilities, communications and information   |
| 42  |    | sharing to encourage public use, language access, ADA  |
| 43  |    | accommodations, and other improvements to make public facilities   |
| 44<br>45  | 6  | more accessible to more people.<br>"Operations, maintenance, and safety funds for public facilities, amenities,  |
| 45<br>46  | υ. | and infrastructure created or improved through this fund."   |
| 47  |    | • This is the same proposal as the one in Project Anchorage, but   |
| 48  |    | contemplates that the funding can be used on existing and new  |
| 49  |    | buildings, provided that they received sales tax funding for   |

1 2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17 18 19

20 21

22 23

24

25

26

27 28

29

30

31

32

33

34

improvements, and are public facilities or amenities. This funding is not intended to fully subsidize or replace existing operational revenue streams for all public facilities, but can be used to support operations.

The language in the last item on the list is intended to draw a clear distinction between use of public funds to improve <u>private</u> property (as a one-time capital investment) and use of the funds for public facilities. The idea of this version, and Project Anchorage, is to ensure anything built with sales tax funds has a stable revenue stream to operate and maintain these assets. This certainly should be the case for public properties, but should not be understood to be an ongoing revenue source for private property owners who receive a one-time benefit, or an obligation by the Municipality to commit further funds to future projects at these same private properties for maintenance. Using these funds for private property is to provide one-time catalyzing funds to incentivize repairs, construction, and meeting needs the real estate market cannot on its own, not to subsidize ongoing operations.

### Additional Policy and Choices to Address in Implementation Ordinance(s)

This version does not directly address the many other policy choices to make regarding implementation of a new tax. Some ideas are noted briefly here for future consideration:

- The portion of the tax for property tax relief, as a percent of total revenue, will vary year over year. While taxpayers will inevitably experience some volatility in their tax bills in the first years of the tax, there may be ways to smooth out peaks and dips long term with a policy like calculating the under-the-cap portion of revenue over a 3-year average (using the most recent 3 years of collections on a rolling basis). This may require more enabling language in the ballot measure, but was not specifically included in this version.
- Maximum taxable amounts on a transaction should not be set across the board, but considered for categories of higher-price goods and services. For example, transaction caps can be set for vehicles, boats, and airplanes, that may be different than those for materials such as lumber and appliances; separate limits may be appropriate for contract services. There should be further modeling to define appropriate levels by product and service type.
- Exemptions are not directly addressed in the ballot language, but allows for 35 • an ordinance setting exemptions in code, which will have its own public 36 37 hearing process. Many exemptions in other versions are worthy of consideration, but there are two distinct approaches proposed, that should 38 be reconciled. The first is to exempt certain goods and services, no matter 39 40 who the purchaser is: the second is to exempt certain people or households from paying the tax on any goods, based on socioeconomic status. While a 41 blend of these approaches may be appropriate (for example, exempting rent 42 or medical services for all people), in several situations they are duplicative. 43
- Recognizing the cost of collection for this tax, and the different level of administrative work for larger and smaller businesses, there could be a limited exemption for businesses to offset these costs, where businesses retain a portion of tax revenue they collect. One design option is defining tiers based on total revenue, rather than a percentage of total sales tax collected, because it can allow for a more generous exemption "floor" for very small

1 operations. This example is based on businesses' reported gross revenue: 2 Less than \$10,000 gross revenue: can retain a credit up to \$1,000 3 At least \$10,000 and less than \$50,000: up to \$1,500 • At least \$50,000 and less than \$100,000: up to \$2,000 4 5 • At least \$100,000 and less than \$500,000: up to \$3,000 • At least \$500,000 and less than \$1,000,000: up to \$4,000 6 7 • More than \$1,000,000: up to \$5,000 8 Other versions include adoption of the Alaska Remote Seller Sales Tax • Code, entity authorized to collect remote sales (online sales) from individuals 9 on behalf of communities, and remit to those communities. The MOA already 10 participates in this for alcohol sales completed online and shipped to 11 customers; this should be included, and not require approval on the ballot. 12 13 14 Another Critical Future Revenue Source: Stormwater Utility (SWU) This proposal does not directly address, but recognizes the need for, 15 implementation of a stormwater utility (SWU). This new utility is already authorized 16 in code, but needs to be operationalized. SWUs are common practice in American 17 cities to address stormwater, drainage, and runoff needs, and the impacts of water 18 19 on infrastructure and the built environment, separately from wastewater and solid 20 waste generation, which are handled by existing utilities. This utility is intended to 21 fund, over time, the infrastructure needed to manage drainage and runoff. Unmanaged drainage issues continue to be a significant cost driver in the 22 23 Municipality's capital projects, from emergency repairs to upgrades, as well as for 24 Anchorage property owners who experience damage from flooding, erosion, and 25 other impacts. Like many other types of infrastructure, the Municipality has a large 26 backlog of projects to address stormwater issues. 27 28 All property owners would likely be rate payers, similar to how customers connected 29 to city water and sewer pay for this service. Ratepayers who reduce or prevent runoff of stormwater from their property into the system will also reduce their 30 financial obligations to pay into this shared system, but large property owners, 31 particularly those with surface parking lots and insufficient stormwater retention, will 32 33 see the largest cost increases. While it is not practical to directly tie together the 34 question of a sales tax including property tax relief with implementation actions for 35 the new SWU, it should be noted that property tax relief can be seen as an offset 36 for those property owners who stand to have the highest rates. For this reason, the 37 property tax relief portion was not removed in this version, but remains with the 38 intent that it is seen as an offset offered, with the understanding the SWU will be implemented as soon as is feasible. 39

40

#### Precedents for Public Investment in City Improvements

41 42 43

## Special Assessment Districts

Existing Municipal code (<u>AMC 19.10.020</u>)<sup>1</sup> describes creation of special assessment districts, and the variety of infrastructure, capital improvements, and services that

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> AMC 19.10.020 Special Assessment Districts: Authorized improvements and services. Direct link: <u>https://library.municode.com/ak/anchorage/codes/code\_of\_ordinances?nodeId=TIT19SPAS\_CH19.10SPAS\_DIAU\_19.10.020AUIMSE</u>

are generally authorized to use with special assessment funding. This is the legal framework for the Downtown Improvement District, and services provided by Anchorage Downtown Partnership (ADP).

#### City-building in Late 19<sup>th</sup> and Early 20<sup>th</sup> Century America

The years before and after the turn of the last century were a period of massive wealth-building, economic growth, and urbanization of American communities, spurred by key technological advancements including electrification, light passenger rail, invention of the car, steel construction. This rapid growth also brought a large population of workers to cities seeking opportunity, as well as complex social issues to cities: tenement (substandard) housing, water and sanitation needs, urban poverty, and other challenges with many humans living together in the same spaces.

To address these challenges, two distinct movements arose, both of which had lasting impact on the physical form and complex operational systems of cities:

The first was the City Beautiful movement, which focused on building grand civic buildings, parkways, and amenities for American cities to rival the large, wealthy cities of Europe. This approach left a legacy of civic monuments, institutions, and public spaces that came to define the character of our major cities: examples include Chicago's lakeshore, Washington D.C.'s National Mall, and Coral Gables, Florida.

The second was less visible today, but equally important: Progressive social reforms championed by city leaders such as Theodore Roosevelt in New York City, advocates such as Jane Addams with Hull House in Chicago, and others. These efforts focused on building urban infrastructure such as sanitation systems, drinking fountains, and public transportation; improving standard of living through regulation of housing quality, working conditions, and public education; and ensuring swift and effective emergency response through creation of fire and police departments.

Both movements made great and lasting contributions to cities: when considering how, and what, to build great cities in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, we would be wise to remember the value in investing in both our needs *and* our aspirations.

#### I request your support for the ordinance.

| 36 | Reviewed by:            |                               |
|----|-------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 37 | Reviewed by:            | Assembly Counsel's Office     |
| 38 |                         |                               |
| 39 | Respectfully submitted: | Anna Brawley, Assembly Member |
| 40 |                         | District 3, West Anchorage    |