

To: Local Boundary Commission
From: Avi J. Friedman, Commercial Fisherman and Small Processor
Re: Petition For Annexation by the City of Dillingham

I strongly object to the City of Dillingham annexing Ekuk Beach.

The Petitioner states that they would like to annex 396 sq. miles of water and 3 miles of land (small islands). This is disingenuous at best as Ekuk Beach is not a small island. Ekuk Beach is mainland Alaska. The water is irrelevant; it's what is on the land that counts.

The City of Dillingham has expressed interest in annexing (taxing) Ekuk Beach several times before. Now they are trying to do it again. But never have I or anyone else out at Ekuk Beach heard word one about any tax monies to be spent on infrastructure improvements out at Ekuk Beach. It is very clear that the City of Dillingham is looking at Ekuk Beach as a source of money, but has no intention whatsoever of returning any of that tax money to Ekuk Beach in the form of infrastructure improvements.

People living and fishing at Ekuk Beach are not responsible for the Mayor and City of Dillingham's inability to balance their budget. On the contrary, fishermen at Ekuk Beach spend great sums of money in the City of Dillingham supporting local merchants, every year.

Because this attempt by the City of Dillingham to tax Ekuk Beach is clearly a one-sided money grab, I am against any annexation of Ekuk Beach by the City of Dillingham, and hope the Local Boundary Commission denies and stops this annexation attempt.

Yours, Avi J. Friedman

Avi J. Friedman
9-30-10



Avi J. Friedman
Friedman Family Fisheries
6109 Pimlico Rd.
Baltimore, MD 21209

RECEIVED
OCT 04 2010
Local Boundary Commission