Broyles, Randi

From:Blankenship, JohniSent:Tuesday, January 14, 2020 2:15 PMTo:Broyles, RandiSubject:FW: <EXTERNAL-SENDER>Ord 2020-01 candidate qualifications

Public comment

From: Mary Griswold [mailto:mgrt@xyz.net]
Sent: Tuesday, January 14, 2020 1:39 PM
To: Smalley, Hal <HSmalley@kpb.us>; Carpenter, Kenn <KCarpenter@kpb.us>; Hibbert, Brent <bhibbert@kpb.us>;
Bjorkman, Jesse <JBjorkman@kpb.us>; Cox, Tyson <tysoncox@kpb.us>; Blankenship, Johni <JBlankenship@kpb.us>;
Thompson, Colette <CThomp@kpb.us>
Subject: <EXTERNAL-SENDER>Ord 2020-01 candidate qualifications

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 support a one-year residency requirement for candidates for KPB elections.

I recommend that the reporting requirements in Section 1 E either be amended to address absences from the Kenai Peninsula Borough instead of from the State of Alaska, or be eliminated.

"E. A candidate for any of the above offices shall declare in writing all absences from the State of Alaska of over 45 days during the 12 months prior to filing for office along with the reason for the absence."

Allowed absences (employment, education, military service, medical treatment, and vacation) apply whether they are in-state or out-of-state. Visiting relatives for more than 45 days would not disqualify a candidate, whether the visit was to Seattle or to Anchorage, for example. This reporting requirement does not clarify the definition of residency. If it is intended to help catch non-residents, it should apply to absences from the KPB since that is where we want candidates to prove residency.

I would prefer elimination of this reporting requirement because it seems intrusive since there is nothing in the ordinance prohibiting absences of over 45 days.

Thank you for your consideration,

Mary Griswold Homer