

## Lonnie McKechnie

---

**From:** Fonov  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 22, 2026 2:14 PM  
**To:** Lonnie McKechnie  
**Subject:** Reconsideration 26-046

I am asking that we reconsider yesterday's vote on the Local Improvement District threshold. I believe we made a mistake by setting it at 75%. That level is so high that it will effectively prevent almost every LID from ever happening, even when the vast majority of property owners support the project.

**Two-thirds or 60% thresholds** are standard across government and business when decisions carry major consequences:

- **U.S. Congress** uses two-thirds to override a veto, convict in impeachment, ratify treaties, or propose constitutional amendments.
- **State legislatures**, including Alaska, routinely require two-thirds to override a governor's veto.
- **Local governments** commonly use two-thirds to override a mayor's veto, Anchorage requires 8 of 12 votes.
- **Corporate governance** demands a two-thirds shareholder vote to approve mergers, sell the company, or change the charter.
- **International** the UN Security Council needs exactly 60% (9 of 15 votes) for binding resolutions.

Even for **Local Improvement Districts**, where property owners pay 100% of the cost, conservative states set the bar at two-thirds. Texas and Idaho allow protests from owners of two-thirds of the property to block an LID. Utah often requires two-thirds of owners and two-thirds of property value to create one.

A 75% threshold is simply unrealistic. Two-thirds strikes the right balance, it protects property owners while still allowing beneficial improvements to happen when strong neighborhood support exists.

I respectfully request that we bring this back for reconsideration and lower the requirement to two-thirds.

Dmitri Fonov