

Broyles, Randi

From: Blankenship, Johni
Sent: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:40 PM
To: Broyles, Randi
Subject: FW: <EXTERNAL-SENDER>Ordinance 2019-24

From: Susan Cushing [mailto:cushinghouse@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, May 04, 2020 1:40 PM
To: BoroughAssembly <Borough-Assembly@kpb.us>
Subject: <EXTERNAL-SENDER>Ordinance 2019-24

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'm going through Dr. F.J. Phillips' (my Dad) papers now in this time of Sheltering in Place. I came across a letter he wrote to me in 1979 with memories of a trail here. My dad was a doctor/chest surgeon at the Seward Sanatorium 1950-57 during the Tuberculosis Pandemic. Not only was he the doctor for the people of Seward, he flew to Homer once a month in a small plane and doctored people here in Homer. He helped get funding from the Feds and Territorial government for the first hospital. Governor Gruening, Commissioner of Health Albrecht, and my dad strategized that if they put the Public Health Nurse's office in the hospital, it would be eligible for Territorial and Federal funding. He and Mayor Leo Rhode laid the first cornerstone of the Homer Hospital in 1956.

He has written about a trail here:

"There is still evidence here and there of the "OL Pioneer Trail" from Homer to Kenai that courses through the Caribou Hills. In the gold rush days, miners left the ship at Homer and walked that trail to Kenai. I think it also had another name, but I don't recall it."

This is a bit of Alaska history. There are many trails used over the last century that still exist. They represent the spirit of frontiership: the access to the land and its resources. As more and more people discover the beauty of Alaska, they want to buy it. We cannot forget the history of the pioneers who came here and freely established a way of life that depended on access to the hills, the streams, the waterways, the mountains, the trails. More and more this freedom disappears. The general public does not have the funds to buy out Alaska. Some of Alaska can be For Sale, but not historical public access to old trails. Our elected leaders have been wise in protecting dedicated trails by historical use for the public.

I urge you to reconsider the Ordinance that would be changed to allow conversion of public Right Of Way's to private ownership. This was a good standing policy, one our historical pioneers would cherish. It is being tested now. The entire Borough relies on your reconsideration to protect legacies of our pioneers.

Thank you,
Susan Phillips Cushing
Citizen
1423 Bay Avenue
Homer, Ak. 99603
(907) 235-4850

--

Susan Phillips Cushing

--

Susan Phillips Cushing

Broyles, Randi

From: Blankenship, Johni
Sent: Monday, May 4, 2020 2:48 PM
To: Broyles, Randi
Subject: FW: <EXTERNAL-SENDER>Fw: Ord 2019-24 gated communities reconsideration

From: Mary Griswold [mailto:mgmt@xyz.net]
Sent: Monday, May 04, 2020 2:44 PM
To: Blankenship, Johni <JBlankenship@kpb.us>
Subject: <EXTERNAL-SENDER>Fw: Ord 2019-24 gated communities reconsideration

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 include in public comments for the 05.05 assembly meeting:

From: Mary Griswold
Sent: Monday, May 04, 2020 2:38 PM
To: tysoncox@kpb.us ; jbjorkman@kpb.us
Subject: Ord 2019-24 gated communities reconsideration

Please vote to reconsider Ord 2019-24 and then vote to defeat it as written. I happen to be one of the Homer-area recreational users of the trail and borough road off Skyline Drive that sparked this ordinance. However, the issue is much larger than losing this one public access. Many undeveloped and little-travelled borough rights-of-way are used by pedestrians, ATVs, snow machines, and horses. It is important to maintain public access for recreation where possible as we see more areas developed and some roadways become inaccessible for recreation. I do a lot of walking on borough (and Homer city) roads, especially dead-ends or ones that lead to more remote areas of state or borough land. We are lucky to have such easy access to outdoor enjoyment. Please protect public access and defeat Ord 2019.24.

Thank you for your consideration.

Mary Griswold
Homer

Broyles, Randi

From: Blankenship, Johni
Sent: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:24 PM
To: Broyles, Randi
Subject: FW: <EXTERNAL-SENDER>Ordinance 2019-24

From: chas laforge [mailto:chaslaforge@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, May 04, 2020 1:10 PM
To: Cox, Tyson <tysoncox@kpb.us>
Cc: BoroughAssembly <Borough-Assembly@kpb.us>
Subject: <EXTERNAL-SENDER>Ordinance 2019-24

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 Member Cox and the Kenai Borough Assembly,

My name is Charlie LaForge. I have been a resident of the Kenai Peninsula since 1989. I have just outside of Soldotna for the past 20 years, and the prior 11 years I lived off East End Road outside Homer.

For some years, I have used a right-of-way to access a former trapper cabin off the road system where I lived, allowed access on my property for others to pass through to access views, and I routinely use publicly dedicated rights-of-way to access hiking trails. I believe borough roads and rights-of-way to be necessary for public entry for hiking paths, and protecting them is important to me.

I know that if a gated community is proposed, that doesn't mean rights-of-way and use of public roads are automatically granted. Landowners fronting such roads need to all agree to the access to be used and the right-of-way vacated. What bothers me is that means a very limited number of people, those living adjacent to the public road which would access the gated community, have a say in what eventually affects the rest of us. I believe not having a voice in, and losing these access points unnecessarily decreases a way of life that we greatly value.

Please reverse your stand on Ordinance 2019-24. Thank you for this opportunity to address you and the Assembly members.

Sincerely,

Charlie

Charlie LaForge

47930 Snipe Avenue

Broyles, Randi

From: Blankenship, Johni
Sent: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:58 PM
To: Broyles, Randi
Subject: FW: <EXTERNAL-SENDER>Additional Comment on Ordinance 2019-24

From: Barbara McNinch [mailto:bmcninch@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, May 04, 2020 12:39 PM
To: BoroughAssembly <Borough-Assembly@kpb.us>; Cox, Tyson <tysoncox@kpb.us>
Subject: <EXTERNAL-SENDER>Additional Comment on Ordinance 2019-24

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 Tyson,

I had spoken with you earlier today after having sent you an email regarding the above-mentioned ordinance. Thank you for your time and explaining your thoughts on this matter to me.

I knew there was something I was thinking, but at the time just couldn't wrap my mind around putting it into words. You had mentioned feeling gated communities and vacating rights-of-way were two different things. You also mentioned that if someone wants to build a gated community with access on an existing Borough Road, the adjacent landowners would need to be in agreement for that to happen. I get all that, but what concerns me is that many people who use existing rights-of-way are then left out of the decision making process. Private decisions of borough road and rights-of-way use does not sit well with me. That is a main reason why I urge you to change your mind and stand with Dunne, Cooper, Johnson, and Smalley on Ordinance 2019-24.

Again, thank you for your kindness while speaking with me. May you be guided to proceed as you feel is in the best interest of folks like me, the outdoor loving citizens of the Kenai Peninsula.

Best wishes,
Barbara

Barbara McNinch
47930 Snipe Avenue
Soldotna, AK. 99669

Broyles, Randi

From: Blankenship, Johni
Sent: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:57 PM
To: Broyles, Randi
Subject: FW: <EXTERNAL-SENDER>Ordinance 2019-24

From: Barbara McNinch [mailto:bmcninch@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, May 04, 2020 11:36 AM
To: Cox, Tyson <tysoncox@kpb.us>
Cc: BoroughAssembly <Borough-Assembly@kpb.us>
Subject: <EXTERNAL-SENDER>Ordinance 2019-24

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 Member Cox and the Kenai Borough Assembly,

My name is Barbara McNinch. I have been a resident of the Kenai Peninsula since 1975. I have lived off of Echo Lake outside of Soldotna for the past 20 years, and the prior 25 years I lived off East End Road outside Homer.

During this time I have both allowed access on my property for others to hike on a game trail and I have also utilized publicly dedicated rights of way to access hiking trails. I am newly semi-retired and at the top of the reasons I continue to live in Alaska and plan to stay here as an elder is our ability to easily access the walking and hiking trails which I have used for many years. This has greatly enhanced my life over the years as I prioritize being outdoors as a way to spend my recreation and leisure time.

When I visit the Lower '48, lack of access with No Trespassing and Private Property signs is the first thing I notice in rural areas, and I have always been grateful that is not the case on the Kenai Peninsula. We have been able to use borough roads and rights of way, rightly so, for the access we need to maintain our quality of life.

I am urging you to reconsider your vote for creating private gated subdivisions on existing borough roads or rights of way. Please reevaluate your stand on Ordinance 2019-24 and join Kenai Peninsula Borough Assembly members Dunne, Smalley, Johnson, and Cooper to keep borough roads and rights of way open as they have been.

Thank you,

Barbara McNinch
47930 Snipe Avenue
Soldotna, AK 99669

Dear Borough Assembly Members

I strongly support your voting to DEFEAT Ordinance 2019-24. It seems extremely poor, and elitist, public policy to convert publicly dedicated Rights Of Way into private ownership. Many of these standing trails and backroads are, and have been, used by myself & many Alaskans (walkers, skiers, horseback riders, etc) for years or decades.

I am a 43 year Alaskan, who owns property, AND deeply understands the community importance of our public ROWs. I so applaud KPB's long history of working together with private landowners, like myself, to create and sustain public access to so many beautiful parts of our Borough, for all the residents of our Borough.

We Alaskans are adventuresome, independent people, not elitists.

Thank you and please vote to defeat Ordinance 2019-24!

Gratefully,

Kate Finn

First a 23 year resident of Anchor point, now a 3 year resident of Homer.

Broyles, Randi

From: Blankenship, Johni
Sent: Monday, May 4, 2020 9:14 AM
To: Broyles, Randi
Subject: FW: <EXTERNAL-SENDER>comments on ordinance regarding gated community for Monday 5-5 meeting

From: bubba@horizonsatellite.com [mailto:bubba@horizonsatellite.com]
Sent: Sunday, May 03, 2020 1:00 PM
To: BoroughAssembly <Borough-Assembly@kpb.us>
Subject: <EXTERNAL-SENDER>comments on ordinance regarding gated community for Monday 5-5 meeting

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.

May 4, 2020

Dear Assembly members,

I am writing this letter in opposition to this ordinance in establishing this area as a gated community. As I listened to members speak the last time you met on the issue, I heard the argument that it was a win-win to have these home owners make their neighborhood a gated community. The homeowners would still have to pay Borough taxes, but the Borough would not have to service those roads. But what wasn't said, was that the Borough would still be sending in emergency vehicles when the needs arise. And if these roads aren't plowed or maintained, these emergency vehicles will still need to get in. It also sounded selfish. Let's take their money, but we don't have to do anything for them.

I am also opposed to gated communities arising because it just goes to show that the ultra-wealthy can establish their own rules whenever they want to. Alaska was built on the pioneering spirit and neighbors helping neighbors is one of the tenants towards that idea. The owners of these potentially gated properties can put up fences to protect their privacy.

Finally, there are public roads and land that these people live on which still can be used by the public and we should not lose that access. We already have established gated communities and if people want them, they can always move in to them.

Let's work together to be more inclusive and not more exclusive. This is one of the great things about Alaska.

I hope you decide to reconsider your vote in this matter.

Respectfully,

Alex L. Koplín

31 years living and raising a family on the Kenai.

Broyles, Randi

From: Blankenship, Johni
Sent: Saturday, May 2, 2020 12:30 PM
To: Broyles, Randi
Subject: Fwd: <EXTERNAL-SENDER>Public ROW reconsideration

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Tymraks <earthacres2@gmail.com>
Date: May 2, 2020 at 8:38:17 AM AKDT
To: BoroughAssembly <Borough-Assembly@kpb.us>
Subject: <EXTERNAL-SENDER>Public ROW reconsideration

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 Borough Assembly members,

I'd like to express my concern on Ordinance 2019-24 which would privatize current public ROW's in the borough.

Please reconsider your vote and keep our Rights of Way open to quiet public uses ie walking, biking, horse riding, skiing so that access is not cut off for these recreational needs but also to keep these corridors available for wildlife passage as well as much needed fire breaks.

Thank you very much!

Evelyn Seguela, Kilcher Road, Homer

Broyles, Randi

From: Blankenship, Johni
Sent: Saturday, May 2, 2020 12:29 PM
To: Broyles, Randi
Subject: Fwd: <EXTERNAL-SENDER>Ordinance 2019-24

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: janice higbee <janice_higbee@hotmail.com>
Date: May 2, 2020 at 9:05:31 AM AKDT
To: "Cox, Tyson" <tysoncox@kpb.us>
Cc: BoroughAssembly <Borough-Assembly@kpb.us>
Subject: <EXTERNAL-SENDER>Ordinance 2019-24

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 Assemblyman Cox,

I urge to reconsider and then oppose ordinance 2019-24. Wow, talk about opening a can of worms. This is a poorly written, poorly thought out and has dire consequences for the KPB public at large. Those of us who like to walk, hike, bike, ski, snow shoe, ride ATV's, snow machines, ride horses, access to fishing and hunting may be restricted on our public rights-of-way if this is enacted.

Is there a clamoring of the public wanting this ordinance? Where is the need? We already have a public process to allow gated communities and existing ROW can be considered for vacation under the exception process.

Let's preserve what we have and not privatize access on developed and undeveloped ROW.

Sincerely,

Janice Higbee

Sent from Outlook

Broyles, Randi

From: Blankenship, Johni
Sent: Saturday, May 2, 2020 12:29 PM
To: Broyles, Randi
Subject: Fwd: <EXTERNAL-SENDER>Proposed Ordinance 2019-24

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: David <dastutz@pobox.xyz.net>
Date: May 2, 2020 at 12:24:42 PM AKDT
To: "Cox, Tyson" <tysoncox@kpb.us>
Cc: BoroughAssembly <Borough-Assembly@kpb.us>
Subject: <EXTERNAL-SENDER>Proposed Ordinance 2019-24

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 Mr. Cox,

As a longtime resident of the Kenai Peninsula, Homer specifically, I am opposed to the proposed Ordinance 2019-24. Converting public lands to private control is a bad idea. I understand the allure of turning over borough roads to private hands and thereby shedding the maintenance costs for the Borough. However, by doing so we have potentially blocked the public from the use of these roads, as well as any long used trails that have been historically been used.

The growth of the population on the Peninsula has made the need for recreational trails more and more apparent. There are a number of trails in the Homer area that have been used for years. The ski trails are a prime example. These trails exist on land with mixed ownership, both public and private, with the consent of the owners. Privatizing existing public land without preserving the established historical use of its trails and roads should not happen. It's hard enough to establish new trails for recreation so it would be imprudent to block access to existing trails.

I urge you to reject the proposed ordinance as written. Without language to ensure the continued ongoing recreational use of any public land considered for privatization, it would be a bad deal for Kenai Peninsula residents.

Sincerely,

David Stutzer
907-299-0103

P.S. I have been involved in trail work in the Homer area for over 20 years. I would be happy to talk to you about working with landowners, recreational trails, etc. if you would like more information.

Broyles, Randi

From: Blankenship, Johni
Sent: Thursday, April 30, 2020 10:43 AM
To: Broyles, Randi
Subject: FW: <EXTERNAL-SENDER> ordinance 2019-24

Public comment

From: Diana Carbonell [mailto:carbonell.diana@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 30, 2020 10:33 AM
To: BoroughAssembly <Borough-Assembly@kpb.us>
Subject: <EXTERNAL-SENDER> ordinance 2019-24

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.

To the Kenai Peninsula borough assembly ,

I urge you to reconsider your vote on ordinance 2019-24. While I agree wholeheartedly that there needs to be regulations regarding gated roads, I'm concerned that no thought is being shown as to what criteria should exist to allow public rights of way to be extinguished. For nearly 50 years the borough has developed agreements with private landowners to provide public access via rights of way. Why are we so willing to give these rights up to anybody with deep pockets and a lawyer?

If a wealthy person decides to build a house close to an easement, his wealth alone should not be the only deciding factor in removing forever that public right of way from every other citizen. If that owner has security and privacy concerns they should first employ measures that don't drastically infringe on the rights of others. They could build a fence, they could install cameras, if they are snowbirds, they could employ a house sitter. Only after demonstrating that these measures failed should restricting easements on existing rights of way be considered.

The borough allows for the establishment of gated communities for those who want to live in gated communities, but gated communities should not be created by taking away already established rights from others. I urge you to vote against this ordinance as currently written.

Sincerely,
Diana Carbonell
Fritz Creek

Broyles, Randi

From: Blankenship, Johni
Sent: Wednesday, April 29, 2020 10:00 AM
To: Broyles, Randi
Subject: FW: <EXTERNAL-SENDER>All assembly Members

Public comment for gated community ordinance.

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

From: Shirley Forquer [mailto:forqhoak@xyz.net]
Sent: Wednesday, April 29, 2020 9:37 AM
To: G_Notify_AssemblyClerk <G_Notify_AssemblyClerk@kpb.us>
Subject: <EXTERNAL-SENDER>All assembly Members

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.

As per your votes on the relinquishment of our public right-of-way lands to private hands:
To the four who voted to keep the lands public, kudos!

To the five who voted to close public access and put the lands into private hands, you are going against 99% of the previous input from the public. Why? Your job is to serve the public.

Please vote yes to reconsider this vote, and then vote against the giving away of the public's right to use our public lands.

Hoping for sanity,
Shirley Forquer
Homer
235-8317
From Shirley.

Broyles, Randi

From: Blankenship, Johni
Sent: Thursday, April 30, 2020 2:20 PM
To: Broyles, Randi
Subject: FW: <EXTERNAL-SENDER>Kenai Borough Ordinance 2019-24 (Sub), access to public lands for fishing, hunting, and recreation
Attachments: Ordinance 2019-24 SUB.pdf

Public comment

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

From: Kate & Scott Meyer [mailto:ksmalp@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 30, 2020 2:14 PM
To: BoroughAssembly <Borough-Assembly@kpb.us>
Cc: marla.carter@alaska.gov; katie.sechrist@alaska.gov
Subject: <EXTERNAL-SENDER>Kenai Borough Ordinance 2019-24 (Sub), access to public lands for fishing, hunting, and recreation

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 understand that Ordinance 2019-24 is up for reconsideration at the May 5 KPB Assembly meeting. I urge you to please vote to reconsider Ordinance 2019-24 and then vote to not approve the ordinance.

On April 21, while working in my garage, I listened with interest to the discussion of Ordinance 2019-24. It seemed to me that several assembly members were focused on providing subdivision landowners with a mechanism to protect their property. I found it curious that so much of the assembly's time and energy have been dedicated to this ordinance, given that the planning director said during the Lands Committee hearing there were only 2-3 inquiries regarding gated roads over the last 20 years. Although there was discussion at the meeting regarding loss of public access to roads or trails, I didn't hear adequate consideration of accessing public lands. I'm concerned that the proposed ordinance (2019-24 Sub) is so focused on providing protection for private property that it does not consider discontinuity or prevention of access to public lands for hunting, fishing, or other recreation. This oversight could result in unintended consequences and loss of public access.

Here are four examples that could potentially affect me personally:

1. I live in a subdivision 6 miles east of Homer. Many people in our subdivision and the adjacent subdivision walk, run, and bike daily on a loop that includes both subdivisions. The loop includes two short sections of undeveloped borough rights-of-way that each connect dead end roads from each subdivision (Glacier View Road and Taku Avenue).

It is possible that two or three landowners on any of the four dead ends involved could petition to privatize these borough roads and effectively remove the loop as an exercise option for dozens of people from both subdivisions.

2. I also go fishing occasionally on Encelewski Lake near Kasilof. I access the lake from a borough maintained road called Panda Court.

This is the designated access listed in ADF&G's Alaska Lake Database

(https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__www.adfg.alaska.gov_SF-5FLakes_&d=DwIFaQ&c=euGZstcaTDIlvimEN8b7jXrwqOf-v5A_CdpgnVfiiMM&r=tPUJ05Tsrnc-M5622sY_zA&m=PAEPBnGUrgzYDJAbUg8sMJmLQbSf6L7FyJQpwCZRFpA&s=IGFZYbJgez-xkLGaEVzrJxMdAuFdlNnRhXc0jriSozw&e=). From looking at the plat, it would be possible for two landowners to submit a petition to privatize Panda Court and an adjacent dead end and effectively block public access to fishing to this state-stocked lake.

3. Another example is Aurora Lake, a state-stocked lake located at the end of Detroit Street (off Browns Lake Road south of Soldotna).

Again, the borough road is the access listed in the ADF&G database. In this case it would take only three landowners to privatize this road and block public access to fishing (and other recreation) at Aurora Lake, as well as adjacent U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service lands.

4. I have hunted grouse on state land accessible from Danver Street, a dead-end borough road south of Anchor Point. I have also hunted grouse and cut Christmas trees on state land accessible from Cloudberry Drive, a nearby dead-end borough road off the Old Sterling Highway. In each of these cases, it could take only two or three landowners to privatize the roads and deny access to state land for hunting, hiking, or a state-authorized Christmas tree cutting area used by many Homer and Anchor Point residents (Old Sterling Highway Christmas Tree Cutting Area).

These are only a few examples. Given time, I am confident that I could find dozens of examples of public lands and waters accessible from a dead-end borough road. My concern is that the proposed ordinance does not explicitly contain provisions that prevent loss of public access.

I am comfortable with the creation of gated communities and private roads, but am opposed to conversion of public roads to private because, as the proposed ordinance reads, a public right-of-way may be vacated by the "owner(s) of the majority of land fronting or abutting the right of way to be vacated." I understand that some property owners are concerned about securing their property when absent. Their failure to consider the security of their property when purchasing the property or building on it does not justify eroding the public's access to public lands for fishing, hunting, or other recreation.

Since there are likely to be so few petitions, I would favor a process that includes public notice and review and approval by the assembly of each petition, and precludes privatization of roads when access to public lands or easements could be blocked.

Thank you for your consideration.

Scott Meyer, 40210 Alpenglow Circle Homer, AK 99603

Cc: Marla Carter, ADF&G Sport Fish Access Defense Program Manager
(marla.carter@alaska.gov)

Katie Sechrist, ADF&G Hunter Access Development Program
(katie.sechrist@alaska.gov)

Broyles, Randi

From: Blankenship, Johni
Sent: Friday, May 1, 2020 2:23 PM
To: Broyles, Randi
Subject: FW: <EXTERNAL-SENDER>Public Right of Ways

Public comment

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

From: Cynthia Morelli [mailto:cmorelli@alaska.net]
Sent: Friday, May 01, 2020 2:12 PM
To: BoroughAssembly <Borough-Assembly@kpb.us>
Subject: <EXTERNAL-SENDER>Public Right of Ways

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 Kenai Peninsula Borough Assembly,

During this unprecedented pandemic, the open spaces we use for outdoor recreation are even more dear than before, both for our physical health and mental well being. I live just off Olhson Mt. Rd in Homer, quite near one access in question - that off of Skyline Dr. by the property owned by Zach Brown. For the past twenty-five years, I and my family have walked alone and with friends, and in a rare winter, skied down the bluff along the trail that goes near his property. Often there have been others doing the same when I've been there. It has been a well used trail by many for many years. I find it extremely difficult to understand why the borough - to which I pay property taxes and collect sales tax for as a small business owner - would choose to transfer public right of ways to any private land owners.

Please do not transfer ownership of public right of ways to any private land owners.

Sincerely,
Cynthia Morelli
60159 Lookout Ridge Ave.
Homer, Alaska 99603

Broyles, Randi

From: Blankenship, Johni
Sent: Friday, May 1, 2020 2:34 PM
To: Broyles, Randi
Subject: FW: <EXTERNAL-SENDER>Ordinance 2019-24

From: Dale Banks [mailto:dale@loopylupine.com]
Sent: Friday, May 01, 2020 2:20 PM
To: BoroughAssembly <Borough-Assembly@kpb.us>
Subject: <EXTERNAL-SENDER>Ordinance 2019-24

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.

Hi,

I do not support Ordinance 2019-24 and urge you to vote no when you reconsider the ordinance Tuesday. The beauty of living in Alaska is to get out there and access it, and turning public rights of way into private ones is not compatible with maintaining public access to the great outdoors.

Thank you,

Dale Banks

--

Dale Banks
Loopy Lupine
PO Box 2888
4854 Eagle Place
Homer, Alaska 99603
loopylupine.com
907-235-5100 office
907-299-0524 mobile