
From: mary griswold <mgrt@xyz.net>
Sent: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 7:10 PM
To: Turner, Michele
Subject: <EXTERNAL-SENDER> technical amendment to Ord 2025-21

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 encourage a technical amendment to add "exemption" after "residential real property tax" before "under KPB 5.13.060."

E) One exemption per parcel. One senior or disabled veteran exemption per primary parcel. Only one senior or disabled veteran exemption may be granted for the same property and, if two or more persons are eligible for an exemption for the same property, the parties must decide among themselves who is to receive the benefit of the exemption. Notwithstanding this subsection, an applicant who is eligible for both this exemption and a residential real property tax under KPB 5.13.060 may be granted multiple exemptions, up to a maximum of \$375,000 for the same property.

From: mary griswold <mgrt@xyz.net>
Sent: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 7:08 PM
To: Turner, Michele
Subject: <EXTERNAL-SENDER>Fwd: Motion to Rescind Ord 2025-21

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.

Please forward to assembly members. My original email failed because the new assembly member addresses were "unknown."

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

Subject: Motion to Rescind Ord 2025-21

Date: Tue, 21 Oct 2025 23:02:39 -0400

From: "mary griswold" <mgrt@xyz.net>

To: ryan tunseth <rtunseth@kpb.us>, michael hicks <mhicks@kpb.us>, willy dunne <wdunne@kpb.us>, sargeant truesdell <struesdell@kpb.us>, dale eicher <deicher@kpb.us>, cindy ecklund <cecklund@kpb.us>, lenora niesen <lniesen@kpb.us>, kelly cooper <kcooper@kpb.us>, scott griebel <sgriebel@kpb.us>

I urge you to defeat the motion to rescind Ordinance 2025-21.

The rescission sponsor's justification is flawed. In part it states: "More importantly, the cap of \$375,000 is not appropriate because stacking of exemptions is not currently capped at \$375,000 and I do not believe that this ordinance should address major policy decisions such as the appropriateness of "stacking" exemptions and/or capping that amount."

Per the original memo for Ord 2025-21, its purpose was to improve the organization and usability of the various provisions of the borough tax code. The intent of the ordinance was to improve the code without making any policy changes. This code revision began long before Proposition 3 was approved for the Oct 7 election ballot and approved by the voters to increase the residential property tax exemption from \$50,000 to \$75,000.

During consideration of Proposition 3, both the assembly and the borough attorney stressed that the current practice of stacking the residential property tax exemption and the senior citizen residential property tax exemption would be continued. This was an important assurance to voters. When Ordinance 2025-21 was introduced and discussed, the stacked exemptions amounted to \$350,000. After the election and before the assembly considered the final version of Ord 2025-21, this cap increased to \$375,000. It was appropriate and necessary to amend the ordinance to reflect the new exemption limits. Ordinance 2025-21 as approved by the assembly reflects this expectation for borough residents and complies with the intent to clarify code without making policy changes.

If the assembly wants to address policy changes to exemption stacking and limits, it is free to do so. But Ordinance 2025-21 should stand as amended and passed for now.

Thank you for your consideration.
Mary Griswold
Homer

E) One exemption per parcel. One senior or disabled veteran exemption per primary parcel. Only one senior or disabled veteran exemption may be granted for the same property and, if two or more persons are eligible for an exemption for the same property, the parties must decide among themselves who is to receive the benefit of the exemption. Notwithstanding this subsection, an applicant who is eligible for both this exemption and a residential real property tax under KPB 5.13.060 may be granted multiple exemptions, up to a maximum of \$375,000 for the same property.

I encourage a technical amendment to add "exemption" after "residential real property tax" before "under KPB 5.13.060."