Rasor, Jessica

Subject:

FW: New Public Comment to Assembly Members

From: Kenai Peninsula Borough < webmaster@kpb.us>

Sent: Tuesday, December 31, 2024 8:39 PM

To: BoroughAssembly <Borough-Assembly@kpb.us>; Mayor's Department <MayorDepartmental@kpb.us>

Cc: G Notify AssemblyClerk < G Notify AssemblyClerk@kpb.us>

Subject: New Public Comment to Assembly Members

Your Name: Patricia Bouton

Your Email: blaze99712@yahoo.com

Subject: Eliminating 2nd public comment

Message:

December 31, 2024

President Peter Ribbens, and KPB Borough Assembly members.

I am writing to express my concern with Ordinance 2024-36, amending KPB Chapter 22.40.080, suggested by Mayor Micciche, eliminating the second public comment and public presentation from the KPB agenda.

I am against eliminating the second comment period. We "the public" have a right to have our voices heard by you, our Borough Representatives.

Taking away the second comment period is not providing a more transparent assembly meeting and it is not a redundancy.

The first comment period labeled "PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ITEMS NOT APPEARING ON THE AGENDA."

The second comment period labeled "PUBLIC COMMENTS AND PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS": this is where we CAN comment on what is on the Agenda and the discussions we heard during the meeting.

Your willingness to run for your elected seat, implies you agree to listening to public comments, and allowing us to be part of your decision making process.

Voice public comment is standard practice for public meetings. There is no guarantee email is received; social media is not used by everyone, myself included. Voice media is proveable and reliable, compared to unreliable, unreceiptable email, or social media comments.

Just as the Assembly has closing comments, the public has closing comments also.

Please confirm receipt of this email by all Assembly members. Thank you!

Sincerely,

Patricia Bouton, Soldotna (speaking for myself)

Rasor, Jessica

Subject:

FW: <EXTERNAL-SENDER>Opposed to Ordinance 2024-36

From: Alex Koplin akoplin907@gmail.com Sent: Friday, January 3, 2025 2:50 PM

To: Ribbens, Peter <pri>pribbens@kpb.us>

<jbaisden@kpb.us>

Subject: <EXTERNAL-SENDER>Opposed to Ordinance 2024-36

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.

an. 3, 2025

Dear Assembly Members and Mr. Mayor,

I am writing in opposition to ordinance 2024-36. Not allowing public testimony at the end of a meeting is not a good policy. Allowing the public to comment at the end of the meeting is important as things arise during the meeting that may need to be discussed. Also, if some people come late to a meeting, they have time to speak about something important to them. The meetings are not well attended, and anything that can help bring more people to a meeting is a good idea. We know that voter turnout is low, and subtracting the public comments at the end of the meeting can be viewed negatively as it eliminates a way for the public to be engaged.

I agree with Mr. Ribbens's memo about eliminating the word "public presentation" regarding the second time people can comment, as that can be confusing. However, taking away a slot for public comments at the end of a meeting is bad optics. The public needs more avenues to make comments, not less.

I realize that we have multiple times to comment. As Mr. Ribbens points out, emails, social media, and phone calls are good ways to let the Assembly know your feelings. Nevertheless, public testimony is probably the best way to convey a message, as there are radio broadcasts and media coverage at each meeting that people can tune into or read about after the meeting.

Please allow the comment period at the end of the meeting to stay as is.

Sincerely,

Alex Koplin Homer-District 8 J