

**Matanuska-Susitna Borough
Erosion Zoning Ordinance Development
Public Workshop
Palmer High School
March 8, 2007**

PUBLIC COMMENTS/CONCERNS

WHY AN ORDINANCE?

- Why is Matanuska Susitna Borough taking over State responsibility (Linda – Circle View resident: No support from the State. So started working with the borough. We need the government; borough has helped)
- What Solution: Structural? Bethel costs over \$125 million and river fails every year; in some places structural will work, it depends on the river.
- What about excavating gravel from river?
- Why all the permits? (one of two options) Permits are reality
- State acting like this is not possible. Why is Alaska Different? State lost valuable real estate; state is not willing to act. Dig relief channel that's been needed for last 25 years. Dikes are useless.
- Why not go with DNR's suggestion. Murph O'Brien: ...not a borough project. DNR has option to do it themselves or do it under contract.
- Need to focus on structural solutions, get the river off the bank. Not a program to buy out houses, need control of river. Murph O'Brien: Need to address the existing but also need a "non structural policy" to address future
- Why can't state shorten up permit process; why do they put fish above people

- What do you say to state when they say – need a none-structural solution?
Murph O'Brien: We'll try; if there is going to be a slow down process of passing dollars.
- Dredge & send it back to Palmer
- Ordinance about people control, not river control. Why take problems in one area and use to restrict 100's of acres that don't have problems. Ordinance not going to protect me over my property. Murph O'Brien: "Narrow Slope."
- No to explanations, just solve the problem.
- Why the Knik? – Reason: "We wanted to take a look at the river, knowing full well that "one size doesn't fit all."
- Not right that one person can affect 100's of lives by declaring a river an Erosion hazard area.
- Prefer a warning that you're on erosions area.
- Issue of concern- once area define as flood area leads to \$1500/year more in insurance
- Send out notice in way that takes advantage of knowledge in community about the rivers and historical erosions areas.
- Those against the ordinance take advantage of local political connections. Governor remedy is simple.
- Gravel extraction is a double edged sword.
- Planning Director should inform assembly that community doesn't want ordinance.
- Public should assume some of the risk on erosion issues.
- Public wants structural solutions, not non-structural ones.

- Need to not accept “can’t” regarding structural solutions.
- Chuck Leet: What do you recommend
- What is responsibility of developer to maintain structures – should be responsibility of developer?
- Hazard area -1000’? seems excessive.
- Don’t want an ordinance; want to see river get fixed.
- Circle View experience, all maintenance on structural improvements paid by Local Improvement District (LID). We also want help from state.
- Ordinance should be disclosure of erosion areas.
- Document that home buyer signs saying they take full responsibility should be included (caveat emptor).
- 1000’ too much for hazard area.
- Physical problem, don’t need a money making permit system.
- Don’t need ordinance. Non-structural ordinance won’t stop river from continuing to erode.
- “Notification is great” A Plat note issue is all the ordinance should be.
- Should make process easier to protect you property with your money.
- Need a clear process to show how definition of hazard areas can change if hazard changes!
- Does value of land drop and appraisal go down if identified as flood hazard
- If identification of hazard area reduces value, will MSB consider buyout?

- Does ordinance have affect on Butte? Will that potentially reduce property value?
- Why have values of properties with structures gone down, land only went up?
- Has analysis of other places been done? To draw examples from?
- Can we educate people on erosion issues?
- Grandfathering – don't want "permit" don't want "Qualified Engineer" these things cost money
- Request to please remove Knik River
- Long term solution of river moving is not a long term solution
- Ordinance should be disclosure at time of land transaction and a note on the plat
- Will note on plat help with flood insurance? (Check)
- Build a fire under those who can get up and push for structural improvements
- Is Borough pursuing other approaches? Why aren't we seeing evidence of that?

Thank you to those who attended and commented.