

June 15, 2009

RE.: Ordinance 2009-32 & 2009-35

Dear Assembly Member:

It has come to my attention that a small group of people have approached you with a proposal to expand Borough government, thus requiring an increase in property taxation. I also understand that you are considering placing their idea on the ballot for a public vote this October.

I would like to remind you that when another group of people approached the Assembly with proposals to make government more efficient or limit taxation you said, "Get several thousand signatures on an official petition and maybe we'll consider your proposal".

It is my hope that you believe in treating all citizens fairly and will avoid the appearance of preferential treatment by requiring all citizens to use the same process to either increase or decrease the size and cost of Borough government. I know that you will agree that it does appear very prejudicial for a couple of ex-Borough officials to have their idea for a sports dome placed on the ballot without producing a single signature or other sign of actual public support, while regular citizens are forced to jump through the onerous "official" hoops of the initiative process for their proposals to be placed on a ballot.

I urge you to demonstrate your sense of fairness and non-prejudicial treatment of ALL borough residents by rejecting ordinance 2009-32 and ordinance 2009-35. Let the playing field be level for all teams!

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mike McBride
North Kenai

From: Blankenship, Johni
Sent: Tuesday, July 07, 2009 12:41 PM
To: Turner, Michele
Subject: FW: No on Ordinance 2009-32 and 35

Agenda item

From: Dave & Kitty Thompson
Sent: Tuesday, July 07, 2009 12:16 PM
To: pa12gary@hotmail.com; hvsmalley@yahoo.com; gsuperman@gci.net; psprague@acsalaska.net; cpierce@gci.net; rlms@ptialaska.net; akfischer@hotmail.com; bsmith@xyz.net; millimom@xyz.net; Blankenship, Johni
Cc: Carey, Dave; Chumley, Hugh
Subject: No on Ordinance 2009-32 and 35

Re: Ordinance establishing Central Peninsula Multi-use facility and Ordinance for a ballot issue for obligation bonds of \$25.5 million

We neither support this ludicrous idea contrived by a few nor do we support funding it.

We feel our borough government needs to stick to the three basics; public safety, schools, and roads. The borough has no place spending our money to entertain us. We can do that here on "the Kenai" in many ways all year long.

Projects like this are created by a few for their own "political glory". (hey, look what "I" did). then we as taxpayers have to take years paying for them. That's one of our main problems these days, spending money we don't have. It's easy to spend other peoples money.

Are we not still paying for our hospital expansions in Soldotna and Homer? These are facilities that we as taxpayers, funding the additions, cannot even use because they overcharge us and we have to resort to Providence or Alaska Regional Hospitals. We can not even afford our own hospitals.

Soldotna cannot even afford to keep their sports center afloat due to high maintenance costs. So what is a \$25.5 million facility going to cost us in upkeep and maintenance? More money than we have and more than we can afford.

The City of Kenai cannot keep their Cultural and Visitor center afloat either due to similar reasons.

All the local residence we have spoken with recently on this ordinance feel the same way.

Look at the headlines in the Anchorage Daily News for Saturday June 20th. "**Alaska Jobs are In DECLINE**" The unemployment rate stands at 10.2% (7.2% one year ago). It was higher but dropped due to some seasonal hire.

Walmart is not going to be the savior that some are hoping. Walmart typically has mostly part-time and temporary employees. Maybe a third of their employees are full time, but very few of these jobs are gainful employment. In other words they are not jobs where one can support a family or buy a house. (often these employees will require state welfare to maintain a standard of living, yes, more tax money of ours)

Our country right now, Alaska included, is in the middle of a sharp recession with no end in sight.

Please consider these facts in wanting to spend money on major projects we just simply cannot afford.

David and Katherine Thompson

Kenai Alaska 99611

7/7/2009

From: Blankenship, Johni
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2009 8:57 AM
To: Turner , Michele
Subject: FW:

Agenda Item

From: Carey, Dave
Sent: Monday, July 20, 2009 10:04 PM
To: Blankenship, Johni
Subject: FW:

Mon., 10:03 PM

Please forward this to the Assembly.

Mayor Carey

From: Nancy Veal
Sent: Monday, July 20, 2009 8:51 PM
To: Carey, Dave
Subject:

Mayor Carey,

Would you forward this to the people who are making the decision about this important issue? Thank you. I hope you read it too.
☺

I am absolutely NOT in favor of a recreational dome on the Kenai. What a ludicrous use of tax payer's money. Look at the dome in Anchorage. With their huge population, they can't maintain it. If we have enough natural gas to heat the monstrosity, then we should have had enough natural gas to supply Agrium and give decent rates to the people who depend on gas to heat their homes!

I love creative ideas and I don't think I'm a naysayer. But, use your heads, people!

Nancy Veal

Kenai, AK 99611

From: Blankenship, Johni
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2009 8:58 AM
To: Turner , Michele
Subject: FW: 2009-35

Agenda Item

From: Brian Hakkinen
Sent: Monday, July 20, 2009 9:47 PM
To: pa12gary@hotmail.com; hvsmalley@yahoo.com; gsuperman@gci.net; psprague@acsalaska.net; cpierce@gci.net; rls@ptialaska.net; akfischer@hotmail.com; bsmith@xyz.net; millimom@xyz.net; Blankenship, Johni
Subject: 2009-35

Good afternoon assembly members and madam president
These are questions I have about 2009-35 the dome:

1. How do I know if I am in the area that will be taxed? Will mailers be coming out soon to show the boundaries?
2. Why do we need this dome? Did our borough planner say that by 2010 the borough must have a dome or else?
3. Why is this ordinance moving so fast? Is it so that the supporters catch the opponents off guard?
4. Is there a web link to learn more about this whole project? If not why? This is a large borough project that is operating under the radar. Why is it?
5. Will the borough be on the hook for the full amount of the cost if the supporters disappear?
6. Can assembly members vote on this ordinance even though they are not in the proposed service area? If so why? This is different than a school where all borough residents pay off bonds. An assemblyman could vote yes and it would not cost him or her one cent.
7. Will other residents of the borough who are not taxed still have the same use of the facility as those that are? Can a person bring their tax bill and use it for admittance?
8. Can I decline to be included in the service area if I do not want it? If not why?
9. Does anyone agree that this is more bloated government? Shouldn't this be 100% private enterprise? Where are the conservatives on the assembly when we need them?

These are just a few questions that come to mind on this ordinance.

Thank you
Brian Hakkinen

Kasilof

From: Duck Inn
Sent: Tuesday, August 04, 2009 5:58 PM
To: Blankenship, Johni
Subject: Central Peninsula Sports Facility

Hi Johni, would you mind passing this on to the assembly tonight? I will be unable to attend the meeting...

Dear Assembly Members and Mayor Carey;

I would just like to pass on my thanks for your time spent listening to public comments on the Central Peninsula Sports Facility Ordinances. Assemblymen Knopp and Sprague have invested a lot of time supporting and guiding us on this process and I appreciate it SO MUCH! This process is often confusing and difficult to mitigate and their help was priceless.

This initiative is something we strongly believe will further develop this place we love to call home so hopefully in the near future you will be hearing from our group again.

Thanks again for your time,
Lela Rosin

Soldotna