Date: March 2, 2006

To Annexation Commission Members

From George Davidson

CC. Peter Freer
Barb Ritchie

Re: Our Task & Approach – My Views for Discussion

After our meeting yesterday I became more convinced that we have set ourselves on a path that is not in the best interest of the commission nor will the results of our efforts be of much worth to the CBJ. I may be the only one that feels this way but I think we proved a few things last night.

1. To annex any area to Juneau is of no or at least very insignificant financial benefit to the CBJ.
2. To annex an area to Juneau – at this time – would benefit only the State through reducing the amount of education funds they would send to Juneau.
3. Any resident that lives in the annexed area will need to pay the minimum tax burden of approximately 7 mils. CBJ could not – apparently – choose not to tax these areas.
4. That life in the annexed areas will not change for the better as a result of annexation due to CBJ regulations and taxation.
5. All the data that we generate will be too general and thus useless to the CBJ if they choose to proceed with annexation on their own – i.e. not State mandated. Further, if annexation is mandated by the State, the info we generate will probably be totally useless. Why will it be useless – well because if the State mandates that boroughs annex to the model boundaries they will probably wave all the studies that are now required. The State could not mandate the annexation then require the boroughs to justify the action of annexation. The existing requirements are now there to prevent a greedy borough from being over zealous and expanding beyond reasonable limits. Once the State steps in and mandates the annexation they have already indicated that they feel the requirements have been met or are not important any longer.
6. That there is doubt as to where -- exactly -- the model boundaries lie. Take the discussion last night on Hobart Bay as an example. Is Goldbelt really 80% in Juneau or not? If so should they be 100% or 0%. As a surveyor and engineer I can tell you that I have not been furnished with sufficient information to make a call as to where the model boundaries cut through the U.S Surveys in the Hobart Bay area or any other area.
7. The model boundaries as they now exist are “soft” boundaries since they adjoin areas that have not yet taken action to form Boroughs. Once the adjoining area are formed into Boroughs these boundaries become firm and far more difficult to change particularly if we want to expand our model boundaries. In addition if we try to expand our boundaries after the adjacent area is formed or started to form Juneau will be perceived as bulling the less populated areas. Now is the best time to consider where we think our model boundaries should lie.

If I make sense with the above I would encourage us to rethink our course of action. I think we should review the model boundaries and then take some action.

Maybe the following.

1. We could recommend to the Assembly that they accept the model boundaries
   • OR
2. We could recommend to the Assembly that they modify the model boundaries and indicate how we think that modification should take place. At which point the staff could take over and process the application to modify the model boundaries.
3. In either case I think we should recommend that the CBJ not initiate annexation until the State mandates the annexation.
4. However, if major development(s) take place within any area lying between the current boundaries and the proposed or modified model boundaries – then the CBJ should reconsider holding off on annexation. If they do annex due to development they should limit the area annexed to that portion of the area outside the existing boundaries which is sufficient to include the new development but no more than required to meet State requirements. This would then leaving the “cabin / subsistence” areas in tack as much as possible until the CBJ is ordered by the State to include them.

For whatever they are worth those are my views for you / us to ponder. Thanks for your time and efforts on the Commission.