
From: Barbara McNinch <bmcninch@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 15, 2026 9:18 AM
To: G_Notify_AssemblyClerk
Subject: <EXTERNAL-SENDER>Ordinance 2026-23

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the KPB system. Please use caution when responding or providing information. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender, know the content is safe and were expecting the communication.

Hello,

I am writing in opposition to Ordinance 2026-23. Transferring an eight million dollar public facility to Alaskan Homestead Education (AHE) for little to nothing in return makes no sense to me. It has not been proven AHE can manage and maintain the facility and be accountable to the community. Transferring high value property to a private entity sets a precedent we would be wise not to do. Ordinance 2026-23 should not be passed.

I am a retired KPBSD employee and due to the nature of my position and current job as a substitute teacher, I have worked in all but five of the district's schools. I value both traditional public schools and charter schools.

Thank you,
Barbara McNinch
56990 Bradley Lane
Homer, AK
907-394-6996

From: Bernie Person <berniedeeperson@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 15, 2026 2:37 PM
To: G_Notify_AssemblyClerk
Subject: <EXTERNAL-SENDER>Ordinance 26-23

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the KPB system. Please use caution when responding or providing information. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender, know the content is safe and were expecting the communication.

I have concerns regarding the transfer of the \$8 million public facility at Niklaevsk to Alaskan Homestead Education (AHE) for \$2 million (and potentially \$0 if certain terms are met).

I'm concerned about the "bargain basement" transfer to a small private organization with no demonstrated ability to manage such a large and complex facility. This seems like a sweet heart deal to forward a private agenda. My other concerns include the lack of accountability. There is no standard or method to the community to meet any basic public education standards. Is this a Christian organization - what will their accountability be to the taxpayers who paid for this?

For a private entity versus public ownership, the potential conflict of interest with several members of the AHE Board of Directors also serving on the governing body of the Charter School that AHE would be leasing the facility to, and the precedent of transferring high value publicly owned property to a private entity for little to no cost seems a poor precedent to set.

Please vote no- or at least set standards for real accountability

Sent from my iPhone

From: Jane Beck <janebeckjewelry@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 15, 2026 2:36 PM
To: G_Notify_AssemblyClerk
Subject: <EXTERNAL-SENDER> Nikolaevsk school building transfer

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the KPB system. Please use caution when responding or providing information. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender, know the content is safe and were expecting the communication.

Greetings,

I am writing to express great concern about the potential transfer of an \$8 million public facility (the Nikolaevsk School building) to private ownership (Alaska Homestead Education) for what appears to be \$2 million, a greatly reduced cost, AND which may ultimately and ridiculously be forgiven in the end.

Alaska Homestead Education does not have any experience maintaining and managing a facility of this size or complexity. Furthermore, transferring public property to private ownership strikes me as a dangerous and irresponsible precedent. The financial risks that accompany such a transfer should be a concern to anyone who values fiscal responsibility. I do not support this transfer.

Additionally, while I support parents' choices and decisions in securing education for their children, public buildings should not be used to promote a religious agenda in the schools. We are seeing such a dismissal of our constitutional protocol to separate church and state all over this country, and I do not support it happening here in the Kenai Peninsula Borough. I do not want my tax dollars or borough properties placed in jeopardy by a private entity that has no history of successful stewardship, or which may have the intention of promoting religion in such a public facility.

Please reconsider this fiscally irresponsible transfer,

Thank you,

Jane Beck

From: Angela Head <angela.a.head@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 16, 2026 10:48 AM
To: G_Notify_AssemblyClerk
Subject: <EXTERNAL-SENDER>Public Comment on Ordinance 2026-23.

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the KPB system. Please use caution when responding or providing information. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender, know the content is safe and were expecting the communication.

Dear Mayor Micciche and Members of the Assembly,

My name is Angela Head. My husband and I have lived on the peninsula for nearly twenty years. We own three properties, have started and operated three businesses, and have three children currently enrolled in Kenai Peninsula Borough Schools. I have also been deeply involved in local education, serving as a member and former officer of the Paul Banks Elementary School PTA, volunteering at West Homer Elementary, and three years ago helping a group of parents conceive of and write a charter for what would have become Homer Forest School. We ultimately withdrew that application because no suitable facility was available in the Homer area.

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the proposed Purchase Agreement transferring the former Nikolaevsk school property to Alaskan Homestead Education (AHE), and to ask that the Assembly delay any vote until the public has had a genuine opportunity to weigh in.

I was already concerned when the Nikolaevsk charter application was approved last fall by a Board that included several new members during an unusually difficult period for the District, without a clear plan for how the school would be housed. Learning now that a property transfer of this scale has apparently been negotiated and is only now reaching the public leaves me feeling that the process has bypassed the community it affects most. I would ask: when was this arrangement first discussed, and why has there been so little public notice or reporting on a transaction of this size?

My specific concerns with the terms as written are:

1. Price: The property is assessed at close to \$8 million, yet the purchase price is set at \$2 million, with no down payment. I have not seen any indication that fair market value, an appraisal, or a competitive process was considered before settling on this figure. As a Borough resident, this is a public asset, and I would like to understand the basis for selling it at roughly a quarter of its assessed value.

2. Structure of payment and forgiveness: The agreement allows the annual payment to be deferred whenever the buyer's documented spending on maintenance, repairs, insurance, and similar costs equals the payment amount. Because AHE's revenue for these purposes will largely come from public sources, including Borough funding and the state school funding formula, the Borough would effectively be allowing public money to satisfy what is owed back to the Borough. After ten years, if the property is still operating as a school, the remaining debt is forgiven entirely. As structured, this transaction could result in the Borough receiving little or nothing for an \$8 million facility.

3. Capacity of the buyer: AHE is a small nonprofit formed by parents, without, to my knowledge, financial, facility management, or capital project experience. Asking this organization to take on ownership, financing, and long-term maintenance of a facility this large and complex sets the school's families and students up for serious risk, and shifts that risk onto a community organization with no track record for it.

4. Conflict of interest. Several members of the AHE Board of Directors reportedly also serve on the governing body of the charter school that would lease the facility from AHE. I would ask the Assembly to clarify how this overlap was addressed, and what safeguards exist to ensure the terms were negotiated at arm's length.

5. Accountability and precedent: A publicly owned facility, subject to public oversight, would become privately owned and accountable only to its own board. I am concerned about the precedent this sets for transferring high-value Borough property to private entities for little to no cost, and what criteria, if any, would prevent this from becoming a template for future disposals of public assets.

I would appreciate the Assembly's response to the following questions before any vote is taken: Was an independent appraisal or fair market value analysis conducted, and if not, why not? Is there precedent for the Borough financing a sale of this kind to a private organization on these terms? And what opportunity will the public have to comment before this matter is finalized?

I recognize the Nikolaevsk charter school families are not at fault for the position they have been placed in, and I do not want to see them harmed. But I do not believe the solution is for the Borough to absorb that risk through a transaction this favorable to a single private organization, with so little transparency or public input to date. I would ask that the Assembly table this ordinance until these questions are answered and the public has had a real opportunity to weigh in.

Thank you for your time and your service to the Borough.

Sincerely,
Angela Head
Homer, Alaska

From: Jason Davis <jasondavis63@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 16, 2026 1:53 PM
To: G_Notify_AssemblyClerk
Subject: <EXTERNAL-SENDER> Nikolaevsk School

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the KPB system. Please use caution when responding or providing information. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender, know the content is safe and were expecting the communication.

Assembly members: At your meeting tonight, please do NOT gift the Nikolaevsk school building to a private owner in exchange for several years of maintenance. This sets a really bad precedent and does not represent wise stewardship of public resources.

Thank you,

Jason Davis
Homer

From: ahnie litecky <ahnielitecky@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 16, 2026 4:37 PM
To: G_Notify_AssemblyClerk
Subject: <EXTERNAL-SENDER>Regarding Ordinance 2026-23

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the KPB system. Please use caution when responding or providing information. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender, know the content is safe and were expecting the communication.

Dear Assembly members,

I am writing to urge you not to approve the transfer of the Nikolaevsk School property to Alaskan Homestead Education under the current terms.

I support strong educational opportunities for families in every part of the borough. However, transferring an approximately \$8 million public facility to a private nonprofit for \$2 million (and potentially for no actual payment if the terms are met) raises serious concerns about public accountability, stewardship of public assets, and precedent.

Before moving forward, the Assembly should require much stronger safeguards, including clear public-school-use requirements, transparent financial capacity review, conflict-of-interest review, and a process that protects the public's long-term interest in this property. A small private organization should not receive control of a major public facility without a higher level of demonstrated capacity and accountability to the broader community.

Please vote no, or at minimum postpone action until these concerns are fully addressed.

Sincerely,

Ahnie Litecky

Homer resident

From: Billeen Carlson <billeenc@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 17, 2026 9:24 AM
To: G_Notify_AssemblyClerk
Subject: <EXTERNAL-SENDER> Do not use Russian Old Believer children as political cover for a private property deal.

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the KPB system. Please use caution when responding or providing information. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender, know the content is safe and were expecting the communication.

Dear Members of the Kenai Peninsula Borough Assembly,

I urge you to reject the proposed transfer or lease of the Nikolaevsk school property to a private educational entity.

This proposal is being presented, at least in part, as though it benefits Russian Old Believer families in Nikolaevsk. As a former teacher of Nikolaevsk students and a person with direct relationships in that community, I believe that framing is misleading.

There are very few Russian Old Believer students from Nikolaevsk who would be served by this arrangement. Many of those students are already settled, supported, and happy at Chapman. They are not props. They are children, families, neighbors, and friends.

The Assembly should not allow a private charter effort to use the optics of serving a distinct cultural community when the facts on the ground do not support that claim.

The real issue before you is not whether Russian Old Believer families deserve respect. Of course they do.

The real issue is whether publicly owned land and school facilities should be converted into a long-term benefit for a private educational entity after public schools were closed in the name of financial necessity.

That is a very different question.

Taxpayers built and maintained these facilities for public education and public use. If the Borough now gives a private operator favorable access to that property, the public deserves clear proof of public benefit, fair market value, enforceable safeguards, and honest accounting of who actually benefits.

Before taking action, I ask the Assembly to answer these questions publicly:

1. How many Nikolaevsk-area Russian Old Believer students would actually attend this proposed school?

2. How many are currently enrolled and stable elsewhere, including Chapman?
3. What evidence shows that this transfer serves the broader Nikolaevsk community rather than a private operator?
4. Has the Borough obtained and released an independent fair-market valuation?
5. What protections ensure the property returns to full public control if the private venture fails, changes mission, or does not serve the stated population?
6. Why should one private educational entity receive preferential access to public land and buildings over other possible public, civic, workforce, or community uses?

This decision will set a precedent. If public schools can be closed, then handed over under favorable terms to private education advocates, the Borough is not simply managing surplus property. It is helping create a back door voucher system using public land.

That is not transparent.

That is not neutral.

That is not good stewardship.

Please do not let cultural optics substitute for facts.

Please protect public land, public schools, and public trust.

Respectfully,

Billeen Carlson

From: Billeen Carlson <billeenc@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 17, 2026 9:30 AM
To: G_Notify_AssemblyClerk
Subject: <EXTERNAL-SENDER>A Question of Stewardship and Public Trust

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the KPB system. Please use caution when responding or providing information. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender, know the content is safe and were expecting the communication.

Members of the Assembly,

The proposal to lease out the Nikolaevsk school building deserves more than a discussion about who might occupy the building. It deserves a careful examination of your legal and ethical obligations as stewards of public property.

The Nikolaevsk school was built and maintained with public resources. It belongs to the people of the Kenai Peninsula Borough. Any decision to lease or transfer it should therefore be guided by one overriding principle: **the public must receive a demonstrable public benefit commensurate with what it is giving up.**

I am concerned that this standard has not been met.

The current narrative suggests this transaction is being undertaken to serve Russian Old Believer families. Based on my own experience as a former teacher and friend of many families in Nikolaevsk, I do not believe that characterization reflects the reality on the ground. There are relatively few students from that community who would be served by this proposal, and many are already thriving in existing public schools.

If that is true, then the Assembly should not rely on that narrative to justify conveying a valuable public asset to a private educational organization.

Instead, I ask you to answer several straightforward questions:

- Has the Borough obtained an independent appraisal establishing the fair market value of the property?
- If the lease or sale is below market value, what specific, measurable public benefit justifies that subsidy?
- Why should one private educational provider receive preferential access to taxpayer-funded facilities when other nonprofits, businesses, or community organizations are not offered the same opportunity?
- If the project fails, changes mission, or ceases operation, does the Borough retain a clear and enforceable path to recover the property?

- Has the Borough analyzed alternative public uses that could better serve Nikolaevsk and the Peninsula in the decades ahead?
- Please disclose the projected enrollment by residence, current school placement, and grade level of the students expected to use this facility. The public deserves to know whether this proposal is solving a documented educational need or merely providing a publicly financed home for a private institution.

Closing a public school because of fiscal pressures and then providing its facilities to a private operator raises profound questions of fairness. To many residents, it appears less like asset management and more like the indirect public financing of private education.

At a minimum, such a transaction should require extraordinary transparency, rigorous financial analysis, and compelling evidence that the public—not merely a private organization—will be the primary beneficiary.

The burden should not be on citizens to prove this deal is inappropriate.

The burden should be on the Borough to prove that giving up control of a public asset is the best available option for the people who paid for it.

Respectfully,

Billeen Carlson