

eComments Ordinance 2019-09



Cynthia G...

6/4/19 4:25 PM

Oppose

I would like to express my STRONG OPPOSITION to Ordinance 2019-09 as it would drastically reduce tourism in our area. Our assembly members should not be targeting a specific user group who already contributes to our local and state economy. This is not the answer and would be cost prohibitive with trying to generate additional revenue stream for the purpose of funding education. If the assembly wants to impose a tax rather than work within its budgetary constraints, then they should propose a solution so the burden is shared by everyone who utilizes the services and should furthermore be decided upon by a vote of the people, not by nine assembly members.



Dawn Magness

6/4/19 3:34 PM

Support

I support this tax. I pay bed taxes when I travel to other places and I have never chosen to not stay because of a bed tax or changed my spending on vacation because of one.



Lynda Paquette

6/3/19 5:10 PM

Oppose

My husband and I STRONGLY OPPOSE this tax. A tax this high risks destroying the tourism industry on the Peninsula. It is an unbalanced approach to go after this industry when you have not made the Oil & Gas industry pay its fair share. While that may be more a function of the State budget, the fact remains that the Borough needs to make the State do the right thing so that the Borough can do the right thing and the Borough needs to do the right thing on its own as well. It's quite frankly insane to think that the lodging industry should have to bear the burden of a failure at the State level. This ordinance is entirely unacceptable. We understand there are problems and a shortage. To single out any single business line, especially, one made up by a majority of small families seems particularly mean spirited as if you are trying to destroy this ma & pa industry in favor of the large corporations who can bury the taxes in their "packages."

Just because other communities have bed taxes is not necessarily a justification for the Borough to have one. They put those in place on their own for their purpose, and most are organized cities and towns. Typically when a government institutes a bed tax, it's so there can be additional services or improvements to existing services designed to support the influx of visitors. A bed tax has never passed at the Borough-wide level for a reason. What exactly would the people VISITING receive in benefits from paying an additional 12%? It would appear nothing. We already don't have paved roads, or ambulance service or good fire response (outside of the municipalities'). So they, along with the rest of us, can continue to receive the same lack of service? An additional 12% bed tax for nothing more than what we see now, which isn't much. If this ordinance were to move forward, we'd want to see specific uses identified for the new funds, not them used as a way to make ends meet.

The person who submitted a comment and said, "people don't care about this when they are traveling," is mistaken. People have budgets, and they DO care what things cost. When the economy sucks, people spend less. With this tax, you will drive business away from the Kenai.

Also, don't believe the lies about the economy. The month of May #s are in, and they're not good. Everything worldwide is tenuous! Don't make things worse by creating ONE OF THE MOST EXPENSIVE DESTINATIONS IN THE USA OR THE WORLD TO VISIT EVEN MORE EXPENSIVE!!!! It will not go well for any of us in the end.

If however, you move forward with this in spite of the opposition, then please consider this modification. You must include ALL temporary lodging including Campgrounds and RV parks (they're still exempt if monthly!) ~ here's why: it's the LAND that is the temporary housing. They may be like "turtles" and come with their place to sleep, but they don't have any place to put their accommodation until they have a legitimate place to park or set up, and once they are parked or set up in a "Campground" then that's their temporary housing. The campground.

Our suggestion is to go back to considering a broad-based tax, not one focused on a particular industry or re-consider raising the existing 3% tax by a few points.