From: Patrick Dalton

To: Senate Finance Committee

Date: Friday, April 07, 2017 8:59:33 AM

Senate Finance Committee.

My objections to SB45 (paper filing requirement) do not pertain to urban areas, if it goes through their borough assemblies. These bodies are designed for maximum constituent involvement. In other words, encroachment upon private property rights, while these seem small to some legislators, must pass muster with the will of the citizens. At the borough/city level people expect dialogue and get involved.

The objection is that the process over recent years has compromised property and employment in the unorganized borough in an inch worm fashion. In 2003-4 handymen were required to be licensed- an achievement of the active lobbyists and home builder associations. Later came the two year clause. Now again the full strength of the legislature's muscle is swaggering the politically vulnerable, Alaska's rural citizens, by detaching one of their most treasured assets: unconditional private property.

The latest homeowner builder assault is spearheaded by borough legislators, contractor lobbyists, and contractors from suburban Alaska. Yet, we do not see lobbyists and citizens from rural communities lined up in Juneau to repeal city and borough codes. This fact demonstrates the inequity of the issue at hand.

The legislators engaged in this four year recurring marathon, I believe, are simply overzealous in consumer protectionism. They are most likely unaware of the great cost imputed to the unsuspecting rural citizens. This is an intangible cost.

The sacred asset treasured by rural residents is what they don't have- regulation of private property, but how do I now this with certainty?

There was a historic statement made ten years ago by your rural people. It was in Deltana, and put to a vote. 91 percent voted against what they perceived as an unwanted and unnecessary regulatory machine: a borough. It is little known, that prior to this public statement, two other private polls were conducted. They were corroborated fully by the official vote. I wrote the first, which was mailed to every boxholder. During those years up to the vote, I conversed with hundreds of neighbors. I observed the most common objection was based opon property concerns. You may dismiss my viewpoint, but before destabilizing the totality of rural Alaska, would it not be wise to consider their will?

There exists an obscure clause in Art. 10.6 of the Constitution of the State of Alaska. I believe this is loaded with responsibility. A dual loyalty is required of a legislator: one to his direct constituents and another one as an assemblyman for the unorganized borough. Furthermore it is stated " allowing maximum local participation...". Translated this means rural input.

If you fulfill your obligation to us in rural Alaska, you will respect our desire to remain unregulated. Before Deltana voted, people made personal sacrifices and expenditures to understand people. Will you do the same?

Growing rapidly since the 80s, urban Alaska has gradually become straddled by the regulatory realities of a dense population. This is not necessarily to be admired, but borough residents

seem to be adjusted to it. They have essentially resigned to conditional property ownership. Nevertheless, they have an avenue of redress through their assemblies. After all isn't a free society about being sensitive to the public will?

There exists an outlook split, however. Rural Alaskans have not resigned nor conceded their way of life. It would be unnecessary and counterproductive to getting work done in this fragile marketplace. Moreover, ruralites do not want this. They have come from lower states and boroughs or grown up here and remained. In either case they largely share a common outlook: unconditional private ownership. They voluntarily pay a high price that is unseen. Some plow one mile driveways that lack public maintenance. Some live without electricity. Others drive long distances to hospital emergency rooms. Many lose their homes to fires without rapid emergency response. Jobs are few and pay is low. Small businesses survive barely on a trickle. These costs are endured with an understanding. What they have exists no where else in the world, nor will it ever exist again if it is taken!

I trust that the truth of these observations will prevail in the consciences of our talented legislative body.

Sincerely, Patrick Dalton P.O. Box 1413 Delta Junction, Alaska (907) 803-0092