

---

**From:** Pate, Victoria E (CH2M HILL) [Victoria.Pate@bp.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 05, 2011 12:18 PM  
**To:** Blankenship, Johni; pa12gary@hotmail.com; linda@clerkworksak.com; ragweb@gci.net; hvsmalley@yahoo.com; cpierce@gci.net; bsmith@xyz.net; rtauri@gci.net; suemccl@gmail.com; mako@xyz.net  
**Subject:** Re- proposed Ordinance to increase sales tax

If you wish to feel the pulse of the voters on funding of non-departmental entities like CARTS, KPTMC, etc, here is a BETTER way than putting this ordinance up for a vote....

Place on the ballot an ADVISORY vote which SPECIFICALLY asks the question you want answered, namely

Do you want the borough to provide funds for non-governmental organizations such as CARTS, KPTMC, etc from the General Fund? Yes or No

It may be that voters DO NOT want to fund these organizations at all thru their tax dollars, which would make it a whole lot simpler come budget time, wouldn't it? Face it, the money comes from the General Fund no matter if it is generated by sales tax or property tax. Cut to the chase, and actually find out something useful.

Vicki Pate  
PO Box 7447  
Nikiski

---

**From:** Art Hotchkiss [simon419@acsalaska.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 30, 2011 7:46 PM  
**To:** Blankenship, Johni; pa12gary@hotmail.com; linda@clerkworksak.com; ragweb@gci.net; hvsmalley@yahoo.com; cpierce@gci.net; bsmith@xyz.net; rtauri@gci.net; suemccl@gmail.com; mako@xyz.net  
**Subject:** Proposed ordinances 2011-23 and 2011-24

Briefly I would like to express my dissatisfaction regarding the proposed ordinances 2011-23 and 2011-24. Both are in my humble opinion affronts to the people you supposedly represent. If you should enact and pass such you can count on me and my neighbors and friends to oppose your future reelections to your current offices.

Regards,  
Art Hotchkiss  
PO Box 6914  
Nikiski, Alaska 99635  
907-776-3609  
907-394-0353 cell

---

**From:** john bennett [john.bennett@acsalaska.net]  
**Sent:** Friday, July 01, 2011 8:10 AM  
**To:** Blankenship, Johni; pa12gary@hotmail.com; linda@clerkworksak.com; ragweb@gci.net; hvsmalley@yahoo.com; cpierce@gci.net; bsmith@xyz.net; rtauri@gci.net; suemccl@gmail.com; mako@xyz.net  
**Subject:** ordinance 2011-23 and 24

we are paying to much taxes already,vote no thanks john w bennett

---

**From:** JRM [jrm@alaska.net]  
**Sent:** Friday, July 01, 2011 11:09 AM  
**To:** Blankenship, Johni; pa12gary@hotmail.com; linda@clerkworksak.com; ragweb@gci.net; hvsmalley@yahoo.com; cpierce@gci.net; bsmith@xyz.net; rtauri@gci.net; suemccl@gmail.com; mako@xyz.net  
**Subject:** Public Testimony on Ordinance 2011-23 & 2011-24

Dear KPBA Assembly,

I ask that you NOT pass Ordinances 2011-23 & 2011-24. We do not need or want a sales tax increase for ANY reason! Also, we do not want to increase term limits to three terms! The people have already spoke loudly on this issue. To continue to push these AGENDAS is not in the best interests of the people and businesses of the KPBA. I will vociferously oppose both measures should they make it to the ballot.

Sincerely,

J.R. Myers  
Soldotna

---

**From:** Pate, Victoria E (CH2M HILL) [Victoria.Pate@bp.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, July 01, 2011 12:07 PM  
**To:** Blankenship, Johni; pa12gary@hotmail.com; linda@clerkworksak.com; ragweb@gci.net; hvsmalley@yahoo.com; cpierce@gci.net; bsmith@xyz.net; rtauri@gci.net; suemccl@gmail.com; mako@xyz.net  
**Subject:** Re: Ordinance 2011-24

I am OPPOSED to ordinance 2011-24, and request that you vote against this ordinance. Here are my reasons:

1. In 1992, in an advisory vote, the people counseled the assembly to add term limits of two terms for the mayor, assembly and school board members.
2. The people voted to impose a two term limit on the Borough mayor, the school board and the assembly in 1993.
3. The people voted to impose a two term limit on the school board and the assembly in 2007. (Since the mayor continues to have a two term limit)
4. In 2009, the people voted to reaffirm the two term limit on assembly members.
5. Because the assembly ignored the people's vote in 2007, an ongoing suit was entered against the borough, and this case has not yet been decided by the appellate court.
6. State statutes guarantee that a citizen's initiative shall not be changed, amended or repealed for two years. The 2009 initiative is protected AT LEAST until October 13, 2011.
7. Taking another vote BEFORE October 13, 2011 is disingenuous at best and more likely unlawful.
8. In the November 2010 election, many lawmakers were pink-slipped, because they failed to abide by the direction of their constituents. In the recent (albeit unscientific) Peninsula Clarion poll, 78% opposed increasing the limit to three terms. It would appear voters STILL favor a two term limit.

My counsel: Don't wake up that sleeping dog. Just let it lie.

Vicki Pate  
PO Box 7447  
Nikiski, Alaska  
907-252-4852

Dear Borough Assembly members:

I would like to commend you for your leadership as you bring forward and consider the adoption of Ordinance 2011-23.

The Kenai Peninsula Borough has a history of either providing in-house or outsourcing through community partners (CARTS, KPEDD, KPTMC and the SBDC) funding for the purpose of Borough wide economic growth and development. Working through community partners multiples many times over the Borough contribution as each of these agencies is able to leverage funding through separate State and or Federal grants and this is what makes this process so beneficial to the Kenai Peninsula Borough.

The current budget process requires yearly public review and discussion of non-departmentals, which generates great debate as to the core mission of the Kenai Peninsula Borough. This ordinance designs into the governmental processes funding for the specific purpose of economic stability.

As far as any additional funds generated beyond the current contribution of \$425,000 the funds could be used strategic planning and introducing a Kenai Peninsula Borough Performance Excellence Program that would utilize the development of a strategy map and aligned balanced scorecard as the framework for strategy development (see attached).

This would provide the ability for the Borough to launch a program for measuring and improving performance with both internal and external customers, partners, and stakeholders.

Thank you once again for your leadership, proactive planning, and support of ordinance 2011-23.

Bryan Zak  
Homer, resident

Attachments: (1)  
Kenai Peninsula Performance Excellence Program

# Kenai Peninsula Borough Performance Excellence Program Strategy Map

Mission: To improve the performance and competitiveness of the Kenai Peninsula Borough in ways that enhance economic security and improve our quality of life

Metric \_\_\_\_\_

Funder and Stakeholder Perspective	<p style="text-align: center;">“What measurable impacts must we achieve to satisfy our customers/stakeholders?”</p>
Scorecard Metrics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Total Relative Use</u></li> <li>• <u>Outperform Index</u></li> <li>• <u>Social Rate of Return</u></li> <li>• <u>Brand Perception Assessment (Excellence Question)</u></li> <li>• <u>Key Partner Quality Index</u></li> </ul>
Customer Perspective	<p style="text-align: center;">Awareness + Ease of Use + Performance Excellence Leadership</p> <p style="text-align: center;">“In order to achieve our funder/stakeholder objectives, what must we do for our customers?”</p>
Scorecard Metrics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Net Promoter Score (NPS)</u></li> <li>• <u>User Retention</u></li> <li>• <u>Brand Perception Assessment (Awareness Question)</u></li> </ul>
Internal Process Perspective	<p style="text-align: center;">“In order to satisfy our customers, what business processes must we excel at and how?”</p>
Learning & Growth Perspective	<p style="text-align: center;">“What skills and infrastructure do our people need to achieve our desired process outcomes?”</p>
<b>STRATEGIC THRUST</b>	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <div style="text-align: center;"> <p><b>Promote</b> Performance Excellence</p> </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> <p><b>Define</b> Performance Excellence</p> </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> <p><b>Recognize</b> Performance Excellence</p> </div> </div>

Draft Operational Definitions for Scorecard Metrics

## **Customer/Stakeholder Perspective:**

**Total Relative Use:** This measure will be an attempt to gauge the year-on-year growth of Broad Meaningful Use of the KPB performance excellence approach. It will be calculated by summing the number of departments/community partners that participate at specific levels with the KPB Program. It would likely include:

- Applicants for the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award
- Applicants at all levels of the state and local quality programs
- Applicants to other affiliated programs such as the Veterans Administration's Carey Award, the American Health Care Association award, etc.
- Participants in Baldrige-based accreditation programs such as the Accreditation Council for Business Schools and Programs

As new partner organizations are brought into the enterprise, the set would be expanded and the participation would be normalized to account for these additions.

**Outperform Index:** This measure would be used to assess the Highly Visible Value Creation for organizations that had demonstrated a certain level of maturity in the KPBPE journey. This might potentially include Baldrige Award winning organizations, organizations receiving national site visits, and organizations receiving top level recognition from the partner programs described above. Given the wide variety of factors that impact organizational performance, we don't believe it would be possible to demonstrate a clear cause and effect relationship between the use of the KPBPE approach and any organization's particular performance. Therefore this measure would seek to demonstrate that organizations using the KPBPE approach outperform their industry on key metrics. Obviously this would have to be done on a sector (or perhaps sub-sector) by sector basis and would require that we select those metrics most important to stakeholders and decision makers from that sector.

**Social Rate of Return:** A calculation of the net benefits to society of the KPBPE Program following a methodology similar to the study produced by [Link and Scott in 2001](#).

**Brand Perception Assessment (Excellence Question):** It would be our intent to conduct an annual survey on the Kenai Peninsula Borough brand. This survey would attempt to construct a valid sample by utilizing our internal departments and partner organizations (such as the Kenai Peninsula Tourism and Marketing Council and the Kenai Peninsula Economic Development District) as well as purchasing questions with organizations that conduct national surveys of CEOs. This question would ask to what extent these senior leaders associate the Kenai Peninsula Borough with performance excellence.

**Key Partner Quality Index:** As an initial step in measuring our success at Leading and Guiding a KPBPE Enterprise, we would work with departments and partner organizations to identify a set of quality indicators for KPBPE program and then assess how many of the participating programs are meeting some minimum number of these indicators.

**Net Promoter Score:** For those organizations that are engaged in Broad Meaningful Use (see above) a survey asking "How likely would you be to recommend the KPBPE approach to a professional colleague?" would be used.

**User Retention:** For the organizations engaged in Broad Meaningful Use, how many remain engaged year-on-year, and potentially, how are they progressing through programs that have tiered recognition. This is intended as a check on driving use through churn rather than by capturing and retaining customers.

**Brand Perception Assessment (Awareness Question):** Using the survey methodology described for the Excellence Question above, a question to senior leaders regarding their awareness of and attitudes toward the KPBPE Program.