


 Attachments can contain viruses that may harm your computer. Attachments may not display correctly.

Commission, Boundary (CED sponsored)

From: Reed [krismel99@yahoo.com]
To: Commission, Boundary (CED sponsored)
Cc:
Subject: Proposed Petersburg Borough
Attachments:  [reed.doc\(10MB\)](#)

Sent: Fri 10/21/2011 9:06 PM

R E C E I V E D
OCT 21 2011
Local Boundary Commission

P.O. BOX 1437
PETERSBURG,
AK. 99833

10/20/2011

BRENT WILLIAMS
LOCAL BOUNDARY COMMISSION
DIVISION OF COMMUNITY AND
REGIONAL AFFAIRS
DEPT. OF COMMUNITY, COMMERCE,
AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
550 WEST 7TH AVE - SUITE 1770
ANCHORAGE, AK. 99501-3510

RE: PROPOSED BOROUGH OF
PETERSBURG

SIR: PLEASE FIND 4 SHEETS
DISCUSSING MY NO-BOROUGH
STANCE ON PETERSBURG
BOROUGH

THE 4 FOLLOWING SHEETS
ARE LABELED 1 of 4, 2 of 4,
3 of 4 and 4 of 4

ALSO, THESE SAME FOUR
SHEETS HAVE BEEN SENT
THROUGH THE U.S. POST
OFFICE
AND WILL BE A DUPLICATE
OF THIS OPINION

THANKYOU,
Ron Speed

A NO-BOROUGH PROPOSAL

(1 of 4)

- ① We, as Duncan Canal residents are not any more socially or culturally tied to Petersburg than we are to Juneau or Anchorage. We live 1-1½ hours from Psg. by skiff/boat and road (Paepke's Landing). To do town activities is nearly impossible due to tides, winter darkness, and inclement weather.
- ★ In many cases townspeople just do not understand the transportation difficulties involved in getting from our place to town and back in one day.

We've lived in Duncan Canal almost ³⁰ years and have in large part taken the responsibility to furnish our own services, if we desired them: generators for electricity, roof water catchment, hand dug septic, and the building of our own dwelling with materials totally brought in by skiff and larger boats (no road - no vehicles).

We raised two kids by homeschooling in the early years because town education was an impractical and impossible feat due to reasons noted above. During University, one graduated Cum Laude UAF Juneau and the other Magna Cum Laude with honors UAF Fairbanks.

We are not related to any people in Petersburg and furthermore, have no cultural affinity with them - no "Norwegian blood". We have no cell phone service such as Petersburg townspeople are used to. Picture your life without that!

We usually only go to Petersburg once every week or 10 days. (Occasionally twice)

(2 of 4)

When the borough charter or petition was prepared no adjustments were considered by concerned out-of-town Duncan Canal residents. It's as if the old adage were true, "paying lip service and running roughshod" over the populace. The "maximum participation in borough decision making" spoken of in the charter's preamble is largely balderdash.

② The idea of Petersburg giving the residents of Duncan Canal municipal services is unrealistic and totally ridiculous. Once again, consider the distance proximity to Petersburg. To make a comparison for those familiar with the Anchorage area would be for instance a fireboat (not firetruck on a roadway) needing to transit from Eagle River through Palmer and to the west end of the Wasilla commercial district (at 15-20 miles per hour max) being equal to the same distance as it is from Petersburg to our Duncan Canal home.

Furthermore, for our 30 years in Duncan Canal we haven't had a need for any more than state government - i.e. the token state trooper visit to the area. Petersburg is too distant to offer any betterment to the lives we now live - just more layers of government.

Borough formation offers no enhanced value to us !!

Likewise, we would become a burden to them because their costs, contrary to their woefully short-sighted estimates, would be much more than the taxation possibilities toward which they are eyeing us. (3 of 4)

- ③ In regard to the area's economy one could wonder about the dire position of the exceedingly scary national debt scene and forest receipts the city now receives being adjusted downward or eliminated. State oil revenue and sharing are diminishing. Looking at the borough proposal, the attendant costs with borough formation and ongoing budget costs leave out many components not mentioned because of oversight (or) concealed because of design. (Most likely because of the former).

The lack of total and comprehensive budget analysis is a major flaw in the borough proposal.

- ④ Transportation within the area as has been shown is much more difficult than borough proponents understand. The area is much too great for the small ^{declining} population of Petersburg to govern and the costs involved just do not fit what is proposed. Petersburg wants

to continue its city functions and taxing authority right out into the hinterland as if there were no difference between on-road and off-road living. (4 of 4)

The various tiered taxation systems proposed by the preliminary charter committee over the last 5 years were totally ignored and rejected by the final charter writers. There has been no allowance for the off-road no-services-possible area of the proposed borough. The idea that there is no allowance in taxation structure shows that the city wants to solve their financial and debt problems by steam-rolling over those outside the city by eventually - within just a couple of years - assessing all borough properties to the 12 mil maximum and forcing the outliers to pay for city amenities that people in the outlying areas are unable to have or cannot use.

Summary

There happens to be three groupings of people in the proposed borough: in-city; out-of-city on-road; out-of-city no road.

There is a difference in the way each group runs their lives in regard to independence, self reliance, spending, taxation, and freedom of choice. The borough as proposed does not yet allow for these differences.

Ron Reed
Duncan Canal
10/10/2011