

Biggs, Sherry

AGENDA ITEM *P.S.d.*

From: Sandy Sandoval [Lssandoval@alaska.net]
Sent: Saturday, July 09, 2005 5:47 PM
To: dalebagley@borough.kenai.ak.us; gsuperman@gci.net; chay@alaska.com; bjg@alaska.net; psprague@acsalaska.net; rlms@ptialaska.net; akjfischer@hotmail.com; cmos@xyz.net; millimom@xyz.net; sbiggs@borough.kenai.ak.us
Subject: Fw: Resolution 2005-070

Lands

----- Original Message -----

From: Sandy Sandoval
To: dalebagley@borough.kenai.ak.us ; gsuperman@gci.net ; chay@alaska.com ; bjg@alaska.net ; psprague@acsalaska.net ; rlms@ptialaska.net ; akjfischer@hotmail.com ; cmos@xyz.net ; millimom@xyz.net ; sbiggs@borough.kenai.ak.us
Sent: Saturday, July 09, 2005 5:28 PM
Subject: Resolution 2005-070

We Leroy and Sandy Sandoval of 35798 King Salmon Avenue (at Funny River) formally submit our opposition to resolution 2005-070.

First of all, at the June 7, 2005 meeting, as we understood the request, it was not only to question whether or not the bridge should be supported, but would contain other issues:

1. **Location.** Much of the June 7, 2005 discussion centered around location. Whether you were for or against the bridge, it was most commonly agreed that the current state preferred location "if there was to be a bridge" was the worst location. As a retired Transportation Planner and Director for the State of New Mexico we pondered why the state had selected this location. From a "state" perspective, selection would be one of least impact to the state; then what would another location further upstream (at a more logical site) be a negative impact to the state. It occurred to us that any other location upstream would cause the state to most likely have to relocate its weigh-station. You can't have a road that circumvents the weigh-station which could cause overloaded vehicles to pass with being checked. Maybe there were other issues, but I'd be willing to guess this would be a strong reason the state would consider since a new weigh-station would be major cost in effort and funds to the state. As I recall the June 7th meeting, way further upstream than the current location was favored by most;
2. **Enemities.** the dock and bikeway were major issues and should be. These items will raise the cost of the project tremendously;
3. **Cost.** There were two specific issues: **A)** Should the borough be involved in any funding responsibility of the building and maintenance of the bridge and connecting route; and **B)** what funding responsibility should the State have for the project and maintenance; and
4. **The Bridge.** Should the bridge even be built.

We still have other major concerns that cause us not to support the resolution:

- a. Did you hear about the semi-truck that turned over at about mile five? How about the car that went into the ditch at about mile 7? The road is so narrow and winding and crowded without shoulders or passing distances that adding additional traffic will, we believe, create a high increase in crashes and we are afraid cause fatalities. Everyone you talk to is just so happy the road was paved; but as a transportation planner, it is not hard to see that no future traffic considerations were applied - surely not to handle a through route; it seems that the idea was "let's just get it paved!". SAFETY of the traveling public is not being considered in the development of this bridge - it seems like "let's just build it" is the goal? We would advise against this resolve... it will be painful for many.
- b. When one says its "Federal Dollars" what does that mean; well it's money from Washington is correct, but

7/11/2005

much of it is our own... What is the going rate of federal gas tax per gallon \$.17 or more? A lot of what we call federal dollars is our own tax money coming back to us and some from those who visit us and pay the federal tax while here. When we talk of state funding what are we talking about... is it \$.18 per gallon or more. The state tax generates probably more than \$10 million for each penny of gas tax is our estimate - but you can check this out with the state transportation economist. And is there a tax on tires in this state? How about Motor Vehicle excise tax? How much does the trucking industry pay for its load hauling? All these tax dollars are generated to build and maintain the infrastructure for the state; and especially for routes that are state responsibility. Funny River Road is a state route as it should be; how much more a state responsibility should it be if it connects as a through route to the state's arterial route. Transportation facilities should principally be funded by user fees and the borough has enough additional responsibilities without taking on major infrastructure that should be paid for out of existing user fees.

Funding is a major matter for the borough to consider as well as responsibility and liability for ownership. **Resolution 2005-070 is too ambiguous.** Don't you believe the voters need to know more about what they are voting for or against? There are too many loopholes in this resolution.

We recommend that you appoint a citizens committee to write a resolution that would spell out the facts and still be neutral; and would go to the public for an informed vote.

Sincerely,

Leroy and Sandy Sandoval
35798 King Salmon Avenue
Soldotna, Alaska 99669

Phone: 260-4972

7/11/2005