

LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN ALASKA

Prepared by Local Boundary Commission Staff
Alaska Department of Commerce, Community, and Economic Development
May 2015

Section 1 – Alaska Has Just Two Types of Municipal Government – Cities and Organized Boroughs.

Unlike most other states that typically have local government structures consisting of many overlapping local government service providers, Alaska’s system of local government is simple, efficient, and effective. It consists of just two types of municipal government as described below.

A. Cities.

Federal law did not allow the incorporation of city governments in Alaska until 1900. The City of Ketchikan is the oldest city government in Alaska.

A city government is a municipal corporation and political subdivision of the State of Alaska. City governments are subject to the “limitation of community” doctrine. (See *Mobil Oil Corp. v. Local Boundary Commission*, 518 P.2d 92, 100 (Alaska 1974).) The doctrine requires the area taken into the boundaries of a city to be urban or semi-urban in character. (Also see 3 AAC 110.040(b).)

On average, the corporate boundaries of cities in Alaska encompass just over 30 square miles. However, there are wide variations in the size of individual cities. The City of Saint Paul encompasses the largest area (295.5 square miles), while the City of Kiana encompasses the smallest area (0.2 square miles).

Current State law restricts the inclusion of large geographical regions or large unpopulated areas in cities. (3 AAC 110.040(b) - (c); 3 AAC 110.130(c) - (d)). A city is part of the borough in which it is located. (Article X, section 7, Alaska Constitution.)

Presently, there are 144 city governments in Alaska. In 2014, those cities were inhabited by 162,016 individuals or 22 percent of Alaska’s total population of 735,601.

The 2014 population of cities ranged from a high of 31,721 (City of Fairbanks) to a low of 25 (City of Kupreanof).

B. Organized Boroughs.


Prior to statehood, federal law prohibited the creation of counties in Alaska.

Like a city, an organized borough in Alaska is a municipal corporation and political subdivision of the State of Alaska. However, organized boroughs are regional governments—much larger than cities.

Article X, section 3 of the Alaska Constitution requires that the entire state be divided into boroughs, organized or unorganized. It also requires that each borough embrace a maximum area and population with common interests.

Article X, section 1 of the Alaska Constitution calls for minimum numbers of local governments. Together, sections 1 and 3 of article X promote large boroughs embracing natural regions.

Presently, there are 19 organized boroughs in Alaska. On average, organized boroughs encompass just over 15,866 square miles (528 times the average size of cities). Like cities, the size of individual organized boroughs varies considerably. The largest organized borough is the North Slope Borough (94,762 square miles), while the Municipality of Skagway is the smallest (464.3 square miles)



In 2014, Alaska's 19 organized boroughs were inhabited by 658,273 individuals, or 89.5 percent of the total population of the state. Of the 658,273 residents of organized boroughs in Alaska, 103,820 (15.8 percent) also lived within a city government during 2014.

Organized boroughs encompass about 45 percent of the geographic area of Alaska. State law provides that the part of

Alaska outside organized boroughs comprises a single unorganized borough. As it is presently configured, the unorganized borough encompasses 323,440 square miles. The unorganized borough was inhabited by 75,550 residents in 2014. Additional information about the unorganized borough is provided later in this publication.

Section 2 – Classification of Cities and Boroughs.

A. Cities.

There are three different classifications of city governments in Alaska—home-rule, first-class, and second-class cities. A community must have at least 400 permanent residents to form a home-rule or first-class city.

First- and second-class cities are general-law cities—state law defines their powers, duties, and functions. General law is distinct from home rule. Home-rule cities have all legislative powers not prohibited by law or charter. Details about the differences between the two types of government are provided in Section 3.

Table 1 lists the number of cities of each classification and indicates whether those cities are inside or outside an organized borough. The classification and location of cities are significant in terms of the powers and duties of city governments in Alaska as addressed in Section 3.

Classification	Within Organized Boroughs		Within the Unorganized Borough		Total	
	Number of Cities	2014 Population	Number of Cities	2014 Population	Number of Cities	2014 Population
Home-Rule Cities	7	64,550	3	6,714	10	71,264
First-Class Cities	7	24,238	12	15,962	19	40,200
Second-Class Cities	35	15,032	80	35,520	115	50,552
Total	49	103,820	95	58,196	144	162,016

B. Organized Boroughs.

The word “borough” has its origins in fifth century Europe. It means “place organized for local government purposes.” A number of countries and a number of states in the US have boroughs; however, they are unlike boroughs in Alaska.

There are five different classifications or types of organized boroughs in Alaska. These are unified home-rule, non-unified home-rule, first-class, second-class, and third-class.¹ First, second, and third-class boroughs are general law governments.

Table 2 lists the number of boroughs according to classification. Details about the distinctions among the different classifications of boroughs are provided in Section 3.

Classification	Number	2014 Population
Unified Home Rule	4	345,042
Non-unified Home Rule	7	27,319
First Class	1	1,031
Second Class	7	284,881
Third Class	0	0
Total	19	658,273

¹ A “unified municipality” is an organized borough (unified, home-rule borough). A unified municipality is defined as such by the Local Boundary Commission in 3 AAC 110.990(1). The Alaska Constitution recognizes only two types of municipalities, cities and boroughs (Alaska, Const., art. X, sec. 2). The legislature consistently treats unified municipalities as boroughs. For example, State statutes utilize the same standards for incorporation of a borough as they do for incorporation of a unified municipality (AS 29.05.031). By contrast, the legislature has established separate standards for incorporation of a city (AS 29.05.011). Newly-formed unified municipalities and boroughs are entitled to identical organization grants and other transitional assistance (AS 29.05.190; 29.05.210), whereas newly-formed cities are entitled to substantially lower levels of organization grants and different transitional assistance. AS 29.06.410 describes the powers of a unified municipality to include all powers granted to a home-rule borough. Additionally, all the existing unified municipalities in Alaska recognize themselves as boroughs in that each is governed by an assembly. Article X, section 4 of the Alaska Constitution reserves the term “assembly” for the governing body of a borough, whereas article X, section 8 of the Alaska Constitution reserves the term “council” for the governing body of a city. Lastly, none of the unified municipalities exhibits characteristics that are exclusive to city governments.

While the third-class borough classification remains in law, there are no third-class boroughs. Moreover, state law expressly **prohibits** the formation of new third-class boroughs. Therefore, this publication does not address the powers of a third class borough or other aspects of a third class borough.

Section 3 – Alaska’s Cities and Organized Boroughs – Both General Law and Home Rule – Enjoy Broad Powers.

A. Provisions Applicable to All Local Governments in Alaska.

Article X of the Alaska Constitution establishes the framework for local government in Alaska. Section 1 of the local-government article states the following with respect to the purpose and construction of the constitutional provisions regarding local government:

The purpose of this article is to provide for maximum local self-government with a minimum of local government units, and to prevent duplication of tax-levying jurisdictions. *A liberal construction shall be given to the powers of local government units* (emphasis added).

All local governments in Alaska – general-law cities, home-rule cities, general-law boroughs, and home-rule boroughs – enjoy broad powers. The Alaska Supreme Court has noted with respect to the constitution provision for a liberal construction of the powers of local government as follows:

The constitutional rule of liberal construction was intended to make explicit the framers’ intention to overrule a common law rule of interpretation which required a narrow reading of local government powers.^[2]

² Footnote 19 in original. The rule, called Dillon’s rule states:

[A] municipal corporation possesses and can exercise the following powers and not others. First, those granted in express words; second, those necessarily implied or necessarily incident to the powers expressly granted; third, those absolutely essential to the declared objects and purposes of the corporation – not simply convenient, but indispensable.

Merriam v. Moody’s Executors, 25 Iowa 163, 170 (1868). The minutes of the constitutional convention reveal that the liberal construction clause of Article X, Section 1 was intended to assure that general law municipalities, as well as those having home-rule powers, would not be governed by this rule, but would have their powers liberally interpreted. The following colloquy between delegates Helleenthal and Victor Fischer is illustrative:

HELLENTHAL: Is there a compelling reason for the retention of the last sentence in the section?

V. FISCHER: Mr. President, we were advised by our committee consultants that due to the fact that in the past, courts have very frequently, or rather generally interpreted the powers of local government very strictly under something

(continued . . .)

B. General-Law Cities and Boroughs.

As noted in Section 2, general-law local governments derive their powers from laws enacted by the state legislature. The constitutional principle of liberal construction of local government powers is reflected in the laws enacted by the legislature granting powers to general law governments. Among the statutes are the following provisions:

Sec. 29.35.400. General construction.

A liberal construction shall be given to all powers and functions of a municipality conferred in this title.

Sec. 29.35.410. Extent of powers.

Unless otherwise limited by law, a municipality has and may exercise all powers and functions necessarily or fairly implied in or incident to the purpose of all powers and functions conferred in this title.

In 1983, the Alaska Supreme Court addressed article X, section 1 of the Alaska Constitution, along with the similar version of the two statutes noted above that was in effect at the time. The court concluded that a second-class (general-law) borough had powers beyond those expressly stated in law. Specifically, the court concluded that even though state statutes did not specifically authorize a second-class borough to dispose of land by lottery, that power was “fairly implied.” (*Gilman v. Martin*, 662 P.2d 120, 124 (Alaska 1983).)

(. . . Continued)

called “Dillon’s Rule”, or something like that, that a statement to this effect was rather important, particularly in connection with the local government provisions of the article to make sure that it would be interpreted to give it the maximum amount of flexibility that we desire to have in it and to provide the maximum powers to the legislature and to the local government units to carry out the intent of this article.

. . . .

HELLENTHAL: Now I refer to Section 11. Doesn’t Section 11 clearly reverse this rule that you refer to as Dillon’s Rule?

V. FISCHER: That would apply to home rule, cities and boroughs, but the point is that there may be a lot of local government units in Alaska over the years that may not be granted the home rule authority by the legislature and it may not want to adopt a home rule charter. Alaska Constitutional Convention Proceedings, Part 4, 2690 – 96.

In reaching its conclusion that a general-law government had implied powers, the court cited the irreconcilable conflict rule that it utilized in *Jefferson v. State*, 527 P.2d 37, 43 (Alaska 1974). The court made no distinction as to the deference due to an enactment by a home-rule municipality as compared to an enactment by a general law-municipality. The application of the irreconcilable conflict rule in *Gilman v. Martin* clearly enhanced the powers of general-law municipalities in Alaska.

Those powers were further enhanced to a great degree in 1985 when the state legislature eliminated the enumerated list of regulatory powers of general-law municipalities (former AS 29.48.035) and the enumerated list of authorized facilities and services of general-law municipalities (former AS 29.48.030). The enumerated lists of powers were replaced with the broadest possible grant of powers to general-law municipalities; i.e., “any power not otherwise prohibited by law.” (AS 29.35.200(a) and (c); 210(c) and (d); 220(d); 250(a); 260(a).)

The statutory grant of powers to general-law municipalities has no general limitations such as “any municipal power” or “any local government power” which would imply that the granted powers were limited to those that the court might think of as typical or appropriate local government powers. Finding such an implied limitation would be difficult in light of the language of article X, section 1; *Liberati v. Bristol Bay Borough*, *Gilman v. Martin*; and the literal language of the statutory grant of powers.

Similarly, it may be relevant that the second sentence of article X, section 1 of the Alaska Constitution reads “A liberal construction shall be given to the powers of local government units” instead of, “A liberal construction shall be given to local government powers.” The latter implies that there is some definition or judicial understanding of what constitutes local government powers and invites a court to define what is encompassed by the term before it applies a liberal construction to the power being questioned. If it is not typically a “local government power” as envisioned by the courts across the nation, then the court need not apply a liberal construction to it. The actual language of the Alaska Constitution does not lend itself as easily to such an interpretation and, coupled with the language of the Title 29 grants (“any power not otherwise prohibited by law”), would make it difficult for a court (in a well-briefed case) to resort to limiting Alaska municipal powers to common understandings of what powers are traditional municipal powers.

As a practical matter, under the present language of Title 29, the nature of the powers to which a general-law municipality has access are substantially the same as those to which a home-rule municipality has access, bearing in mind the specific Title 29 limitations that apply to general-law municipalities.

C. Distinctions Between General Law Boroughs.

A principal distinction between a first-class borough and a second-class borough relates to the authority to assume powers. A first-class borough may exercise any power not prohibited by law on a nonareawide basis (i.e., in the area of the borough outside cities) by adopting an ordinance. In contrast, a second-class borough must gain voter approval for the authority to exercise many nonareawide powers.

D. Home-Rule Cities and Boroughs.

While general-law local governments in Alaska have broad powers, home-rule local governments have even greater powers. Article X, section 11 of the Alaska Constitution provides that:

A home-rule borough or city may exercise all legislative powers not prohibited by law or by charter.

Adoption of a home-rule charter promotes maximum local self-government to the greatest extent possible. Tom Morehouse and Vic Fischer, recognized experts in Alaska local government, wrote the following account of the views of the constitutional convention delegates with regard to this matter:



An oft-repeated theme of the [Alaska Constitutional] convention, and one of the stated purposes of the local government article, was provision of maximum local self-government to the people of Alaska. . . . Home rule was held to be the vehicle for strengthening both state and local governments by permitting the people to deal with local problems at the local level. It was also to be the means for promoting local government adaptation in a state with great variations in geographic, economic, social, and political

Committee on Local Government meeting during the Alaska Constitutional Convention, February 1956.

conditions.

This home-rule philosophy was not believed to be inconsistent with a strong state role in local affairs. As the above discussion indicates, the exercise of state authority was considered essential in matters of incorporation and boundaries, i.e., the creation of local governments and their areas of jurisdiction were felt to be matters ultimately of state responsibility. When properly established, however, their internal organization and operations were to be primarily local concerns, particularly in the case of home rule units. Moreover, a “strong state role” also meant that the state would support local governments with financial aid and technical assistance.

Before Alaska became a state, there was little self-determination either at territorial or local levels. Federal law prescribed the powers of the territorial legislature, severely limiting the scope and types of local government that could be established and restricting the powers that could be exercised by incorporated cities.

Throughout its deliberations, therefore, the Local Government Committee emphasized the need for effective constitutional provisions for home rule.

Thomas A. Morehouse and Victor Fischer, *Borough Government in Alaska*, 1971, p. 56.

In 1963, the Alaska Supreme Court ruled as follows:

By constitutional provision cities have “the powers and functions conferred by law or charter.” The meaning of this provision is that where a home rule city is concerned the charter, and not a legislative act, is looked to in order to determine whether a particular power has been conferred upon the city. It would be incongruous to recognize the constitutional provisions stating that a home rule city “may exercise all legislative powers not prohibited by law or by charter” and then to say that the power of a home rule city is measured by a legislative act.”

Lien v. City of Ketchikan, 383 P.2d 721, 723 (Alaska 1963) (footnotes omitted).

In 1974, the Alaska Supreme Court ruled that the prohibitions referred to in article X, section 11 can be either in express or implied terms. Specifically, the Court stated:

The prohibition must be either by express terms or by implication such as where the statute and ordinance are so substantially irreconcilable that one cannot be given its substantive effect if the other is to be accorded with weight of law.

Jefferson v. State, 527 P.2d 37, 43 (Alaska, 1974).

There are 138 sections of the current Alaska Statutes that specifically refer to home-rule local governments. Most of those (104) are found in Title 29 of the Alaska Statutes dealing with municipal government. The remaining 34 are scattered in 20 other titles of the Alaska Statutes.

Section 4. The Duties of Cities and Boroughs Depend Upon Classification. City Duties Also Vary in Terms of Location Within or Outside of Organized Boroughs.

All local governments have certain fundamental duties such as conducting elections and holding regular meetings of the governing bodies. Beyond this, the duties of municipalities in Alaska vary considerably.

All organized boroughs as well as home-rule and first-class cities in the unorganized borough must operate municipal school districts. Second-class cities in the unorganized borough and cities in organized boroughs are not authorized to do so.

All organized boroughs, along with home-rule and first-class cities in the unorganized borough, must also exercise planning, platting, and land use regulation. Second-class cities in the unorganized borough are permitted, but not required, to exercise those powers. Home-rule, first-class, and second-class cities in organized boroughs may exercise planning, platting, and land-use regulation powers only if those powers have been delegated to them by the borough.

Organized boroughs also have the duty to collect municipal property, sales, and use taxes levied within their boundaries.

Otherwise, municipal powers are exercised at the discretion of local governments. Second-class cities are not obligated by law to provide any particular service.

Organized boroughs may provide services on three jurisdictional levels. These are (1) areawide (i.e., throughout the entire borough); (2) nonareawide (i.e., in that part of the

borough outside of cities); and (3) service area (the size and configuration of service areas may vary, they may even include territory within the boundaries of city governments under certain circumstances).³

The Alaska Constitution (article X, section 5) and Alaska Statutes (AS 29.35.450) prohibit the creation of new service areas if services can be provided by an existing service area, annexation to a city, or incorporation of a new city.

Tables 3 and 4 provide additional information concerning the powers and duties of the various types of cities and boroughs.

Section 5 – The Unorganized Borough Is Unlike an Organized Borough.

Unlike cities and organized boroughs, the unorganized borough is not a municipal corporation or political subdivision of the State of Alaska.

Unorganized boroughs were intended to serve as a means to decentralize state services and to foster local participation in the administration of state programs within regions not ready or suited for organized borough status.

Article X, section 6 of the Alaska Constitution stipulates that, “The legislature shall provide for the performance of services it deems necessary or advisable in unorganized boroughs, allowing for maximum local participation and responsibility. It may exercise any power or function in an unorganized borough which the assembly may exercise in an organized borough.”

Ostensibly to carry out the constitutional mandate that the entire state be divided into boroughs, organized or unorganized, the 1961 Legislature enacted a law providing that all areas not within the boundaries of an organized borough constitute a single unorganized borough. (AS 29.03.010.)

The Local Boundary Commission has stressed repeatedly over many years that, given the size and diversity of unorganized areas of Alaska, a single, residual unorganized borough falls far short of the constitutional intent regarding

³ “Service area” means an area in which borough services are provided that are not offered on an areawide or nonareawide basis, or in which a higher or different level of areawide or nonareawide services are provided. Borough service areas are not local governments; service area boards lack legislative and executive powers.

borough boundaries.⁴ In 1990, the commission initiated an effort to define the unorganized borough in terms of model boundaries based on constitutional, statutory, and regulatory boundary standards for borough incorporation. The commission's work was completed at the end of 1992. Funding for the project was provided by the legislature. In the course of the effort, the LBC held hearings involving 88 communities. Since 1992, the model borough boundaries have been modified five times.⁵

Currently, 18 different model boroughs are defined in the unorganized borough. In addition, the commission identified five parts of the unorganized borough that have greater social, cultural, economic, geographic, transportation, and other relevant ties to existing organized boroughs vis-à-vis any of the 18 model boroughs in the unorganized borough.

A map showing the 18 organized boroughs, 18 model boroughs, and parts of the unorganized borough with ties to organized boroughs is provided below.


⁴ Most recently, the LBC recently expressed the view that the 1961 law creating the single residual unorganized borough, "disregarded the constitutional requirement that each borough must embrace an area of common interests." Local Boundary Commission and Department of Education and Early Development, *School Consolidation: Public Policy Considerations and a Review of Opportunities for Consolidation*, February 2004, p. 30.

⁵ The first modification occurred to the boundaries of the Prince William Sound Model Borough, which were reduced as a result of an annexation to the adjoining City and Borough of Yakutat. The second modification occurred when the LBC merged the former "Aleutian-Military Model Borough" into the "Aleutians West Region Model Borough" in December 2002, during the course of a study of the unorganized borough. (See: *Local Boundary Commission, Unorganized Areas of Alaska That Meet Borough Incorporation Standards*, February 2003, p. 69.)

The third modification occurred in 2007 to the model borough boundaries in the upper Lynn Canal region, which were reduced as a result of the incorporation of the former City of Skagway as a borough. The model borough boundaries in the upper Lynn Canal region now consist of the Haines Borough and the enclave therein, Klukwan.

The fourth modification also occurred in 2007. The amendment was to the boundaries of the Wrangell/Petersburg Model Borough, which were reduced as a result of the commission's 2007 approval of a Wrangell borough (approved by voters in 2008). Incorporation of the Wrangell borough removed approximately 3,465 square miles of land and water from the 7,200-square-mile Wrangell/Petersburg Model Borough. That incorporation also effected the fifth modification to the model borough boundaries in that the commission included the Meyers Chuck/Union Bay area in the Wrangell borough, thereby removing it from the model borough boundaries for the Ketchikan Gateway Borough (KGB). Following that decision, the commission in 2007 also approved annexation by the KGB of the majority of its remaining model borough boundaries. The only area remaining to be included in the KGB model borough boundaries is in the region of Hyder.

The Model Borough Boundaries have not been updated since 2007.



The Model Borough Boundaries are not up-to-date.

The legislature has enacted provisions to allow for local participation and responsibility in the delivery of state services in the unorganized borough. These are described below.

Regional educational attendance areas (REAs) are state service areas to provide public education to the unorganized borough, except within home-rule and first-class cities. The 1975 Legislature required the then Department of Community and Regional Affairs,⁶ in consultation with the then Department of Education and local communities, to divide the unorganized borough into educational service areas. The criteria used to establish the boundaries of REAs are similar in many respects to the criteria for setting boundaries of organized boroughs. (AS 14.08.031.) In a number of instances, the model borough boundaries set by the Local Boundary Commission in 1990-1992 follow the boundaries of REAs.


Initially, 21 REAs were established. These were: Adak, Alaska Gateway (headquartered in Tok), Aleutian Region, Annette Island, Bering Straits, Chatham (headquartered in Angoon), Chugach (serving Prince William Sound), Copper

⁶ Predecessor agency to the Department of Commerce, Community, and Economic Development, which serves as staff to the Commission under AS 44.33.020(a)(4).

River, Delta/Greely, Iditarod Area, Kuspuk, Lake and Peninsula, Lower Kuskokwim, Lower Yukon, Northwest Arctic, Pribilof Islands, Railbelt, Southeast Island, Southwest Region, Yukon Flats, and Yukon-Koyukuk.

In 1985, the Bureau of Indian Affairs stopped funding schools in Akiachak, Akiak, Tuluksak, Chevak, and Chefornak. The 1985 Legislature passed a law allowing the formation of two “federal transfer regional educational attendance areas” to assume the operation of those schools, subject to voter approval.

Voters in Chevak approved the proposition to form the Kashunamiut Federal Transfer REAA. Voters in the other communities, except Chefornak, also approved the proposition to form the Yupiit Federal Transfer REAA.



Since the mid-1970s, ten organized boroughs have formed. The formation of the Northwest Arctic Borough, Lake and Peninsula Borough, and Denali Borough resulted in the dissolution of the REAs in those areas. In the case of six new boroughs, the Aleutians East Borough, the City and Borough of Yakutat, the Municipality of Skagway, the City and Borough of Wrangell, Petersburg Borough, and the City and Borough of Juneau, they took in only portions of the REAs in those regions. Thus, in those instances, the REAs remained in existence.

On July 1, 1997, the Adak REAA was merged into the Aleutian Region REAA.

Other Service Areas in the Unorganized Borough.

AS 29.03.020 provides that the legislature may establish, eliminate, or change service areas of the unorganized borough. Specifically, it provides that:

Allowing for maximum local participation, the legislature may establish, alter, or abolish service

areas within the unorganized borough to provide special services, that may include but are not limited to schools, utilities, land use regulations, and fire protection. A new service area **may not be established** if the new service can be provided by an existing service area, by incorporation as a city, or by annexation to a city.

Other Entities

Other entities may be established under state or federal law to provide public or quasi-public services to residents of Alaska. They include; tribal governments, port authorities, local emergency planning committees, soil and water conservation districts, regional housing authorities, civil defense districts, consolidated health districts, telephone and electrical cooperatives, historical districts, grazing districts public utility districts, registration districts and local improvement districts. It is beyond the scope of this discussion to provide details about these other entities other than to recognize their existence.

**TABLE 3
POWERS AND DUTIES OF CITIES**

POWERS AND DUTIES	HOME-RULE CITY	FIRST-CLASS CITY	SECOND-CLASS CITY	REFERENCES
Public Education	If the city is in the unorganized borough, it must provide the service in accordance with AS 14. A home-rule city is not permitted to do so within organized boroughs.	Same as for a home-rule city.	The city is not allowed to provide the service under any circumstance.	AS 29.35.260(b) AS 14.12.010 AS 14.12.025
Planning, Platting & Land Use Regulation	If the city is in the unorganized borough, it must exercise the powers. If it is in an organized borough, it may be permitted by borough to exercise the powers.	Same as for a home-rule city, except the power must be exercised in accordance with AS 29.40.	The city is not required to exercise the powers in any circumstance, but may be permitted in all cases in the manner described for first-class cities.	AS 29.35.250(b) AS 29.35.260(c)
Property Tax	The city may tax up to 30 mills, except where a higher levy is necessary to avoid default on debt. Some home-rule charters require voter approval to authorize the levy property taxes.	The city may tax up to 30 mills except where a higher levy is necessary to avoid default on debt. Voter approval is not required under State law; however, some general-law municipal governments have more restrictive limitations imposed at the local level.	The city may tax up to 20 mills, except where a higher levy is required to avoid default. Voter approval is required.	AS 29.45.550- AS 29.45.590
Sales Tax	The rate of levy may be limited by charter. Requirements for voter approval may also be set by charter.	There is no limit on the rate of levy of sales taxes; however, voter approval is required.	Same as for a first-class city.	AS 29.45.700
Other Powers	Possess all legislative powers not prohibited by law or charter.	May exercise other powers not prohibited by law.	May exercise other powers not prohibited by law.	Art. X, § 11 Ak. Const. AS 29.35.250
City Council Composition and Apportionment	Determined by charter or ordinance.	Six members elected at-large, except the council may provide for election other than at-large.	Seven members elected at-large, except the council may provide for election other than at-large.	AS 29.20.130
Election and Term of Mayor	Determined by charter or ordinance.	Elected at large for a three-year term, unless a different term not to exceed four years is provided by ordinance.	Elected from the city council for a one-year term, unless a longer term is provided by ordinance. Mayor is selected by council (or by voters upon adoption of ordinance).	AS 29.20.230

**TABLE 3 - Continued
POWERS AND DUTIES OF CITIES**

POWERS AND DUTIES	HOME-RULE CITY	FIRST-CLASS CITY	SECOND-CLASS CITY	REFERENCE
Vote by Mayor	Determined by charter or ordinance.	May vote to break a tie vote on the city council.	Votes on all matters.	AS 29.20.250
Veto Power of the Mayor	Determined by charter or ordinance, except veto is not permitted of appropriation items in a school budget ordinance (if the city is a school district); actions of council sitting as the board of equalization or board of adjustment; adoption or repeal of a manager plan of government; or of ordinance prohibiting possession of alcohol.	Generally has veto power, with the same exceptions noted for home-rule cities.	Has no veto power.	AS 29.20.270
Power of Eminent Domain	Permitted by statute.	Permitted by statute.	Permitted, but requires voter approval.	AS 29.35.030
Ability to Attain Home-rule Status	Already has home-rule status.	Voters may adopt home-rule charter.	May not adopt home-rule charter without first reclassifying to a first-class city.	AS 29.10.010

**TABLE 4
POWERS AND DUTIES OF ORGANIZED BOROUGHs**

POWER	HOME-RULE BOROUGH (INCLUDING UNIFIED MUNICIPALITY)	FIRST-CLASS BOROUGH	SECOND-CLASS BOROUGH
Public Education	The borough or unified municipality must provide the service areawide in accordance with AS 14.	Same as for a home-rule borough.	Same as for a home-rule borough.
Planning, Platting & Land Use Regulation	The borough or unified municipality must exercise the powers areawide, but not necessarily in accordance with AS 29.40.	The borough must exercise the powers areawide; in accordance with AS 29.40; the borough may allow cities to assume such powers within their boundaries	Same as for a first-class borough.
Provide Transportation Systems, Water & Air Pollution Control, Animal Regulation	Determined by charter or ordinance.	May be exercised on an areawide, nonareawide or service area basis by ordinance.	May be exercised on an areawide or nonareawide basis by ordinance; approval from voters or property owners required for service area powers.
License Day Care Facilities	Determined by charter or ordinance.	May be exercised on an areawide, nonareawide or service area basis by ordinance.	May be exercised on an areawide basis by ordinance; voter approval required for exercise on a nonareawide or service area basis.
Regulate Fireworks, Provide Solid & Septic Waste Disposal, Housing Rehabilitation, Economic Development, Roads & Trails, EMS Communications, Regulate Motor Vehicles and Development Projects	Determined by charter or ordinance	May be exercised areawide upon approval of areawide voters or by transfer of powers from all cities; may be exercised by ordinance on a nonareawide or service area basis.	May be exercised areawide upon approval of areawide voters; or by transfer of powers from all cities; may be exercised by ordinance on a nonareawide basis; may be exercised on a service area basis with voter approval
Hazardous Substance Control	Determined by charter or ordinance	Same as above.	Same as above.
Other Powers Not Prohibited	Determined by charter or ordinance	Same as above.	May be exercised areawide upon approval of areawide voters; or by transfer of powers from all cities and approval of nonareawide voters; may be exercised nonareawide upon approval of nonareawide voters; may be exercised on a service area basis with voter approval

Table continued on next page

**TABLE 4 - Continued
POWERS AND DUTIES OF ORGANIZED BOROUGHS**

POWER	HOME-RULE BOROUGH (INCLUDING UNIFIED MUNICIPALITY)	FIRST-CLASS BOROUGH	SECOND-CLASS BOROUGH
Property Tax	Limited to 30 mills except where a higher levy is necessary to avoid default on debt; voter approval to levy property taxes is required by some charters.	Same as home-rule except there is no charter. Still some general law boroughs have more limited taxing authority established by local action.	Same as for a first-class borough.
Sales Tax	The rate of levy may be limited by charter and voter approval to levy sales taxes may be required by charter.	No limit exists on the rate of levy; however, voter approval is required to levy sales taxes.	Same as for a first-class borough.
Assembly composition and apportionment	Flexible; determined according to AS 29.20.060 - 29.20.120	Same as for a home-rule borough.	Same as for a home-rule borough.
Election and Term of Mayor	Established by charter or ordinance.	Elected at large for a three year term, unless a different term not to exceed four years is provided by ordinance.	Same as for a first-class borough.
Vote by Mayor	Established by charter or ordinance.	May vote to break a tie vote only if the borough has a manager form of government	Same as for a first-class borough.
Veto Power of the Mayor	Generally determined by charter, except veto is not permitted of appropriation items in a school budget ordinance (if the city is a school district); actions of council sitting as the board of equalization or board of adjustment; adoption or repeal of a manager plan of government; or of ordinance prohibiting possession of alcohol.	Generally has veto power, with same exceptions noted for home-rule borough.	Same as for a first-class borough.
Ability to Attain Home-rule Status	Already has home-rule status.	Voters may adopt home-rule charter.	Same as for a first-class borough.