

Danielle Lindoff <danielle.lindoff@juneau.ak.gov>
T. [REDACTED]

Wed, May 3, 2017 at 10:53 AM

Danielle Lindoff

Begin forwarded message:

From: Danielle Lindoff <danielle.lindoff@juneau.ak.gov>
Date: April 26, 2017 at 7:00:41 PM AKDT
To: Nico Bus <nico@juneau.ak.gov>
Cc: curt goehring <curtgoehring@gmail.com>, "Nelson, Brett - NRCS, Palmer, AK" (brett.nelson@ak.nrcs.usda.gov), "Al & JoAnn Steininger" (steininger@juneau.ak.gov), Andy and Joshua Hamilton <andy.hamilton@juneau.ak.gov>, "Bjorn Wolter" (bjorn.wolter@juneau.ak.gov), "Bonnett, Louis & Edith" <bonnett@juneau.ak.gov>, Borough Assembly <BoroughAssembly@juneau.org>, "Brian Goettler" (brian.goettler@juneau.ak.gov), Bud Jaeger <bud.jaeger@juneau.ak.gov>, "Carla White" (carla.white@juneau.ak.gov), "Edwardson, Rob" <rob.edwardson@juneau.ak.gov>, "Egan, Dennis" <Senator.Dennis.Egan@akleg.gov>, "Egan, Dennis & Margaret" <egan@juneau.ak.gov>, Greg Wagner <greg.wagner@juneau.ak.gov>, "Heidi & John Boucher" (heidi.boucher@juneau.ak.gov), Jeff Rud <jeff.rud@juneau.ak.gov>, Joe Flores <joe.flores@juneau.ak.gov>, "Joe Heuelsen & Joyce Mill" (joeheuelsen@juneau.ak.gov), John Bohan <John.Bohan@juneau.org>, "John Taber" (john.taber@juneau.ak.gov), Justin Parish <representative.Justin.Parish@akleg.gov>, "Kito, Sam" <Representative.Sam.Kito@akleg.gov>, Loretta Neal <loretta.neal@juneau.ak.gov>, Lucy & Bill Hudson <lucy.bill.hudson@juneau.ak.gov>, Matt Mickle <matt.mickle@juneau.ak.gov>, Michael & Jodi Wise <michael.jodi.wise@juneau.ak.gov>, Norman Staton <norman.staton@juneau.ak.gov>, Ray & Sheri Vidic <ray.sheri.vidic@juneau.ak.gov>, Rhonda Bunniss <rhonda.bunniss@juneau.ak.gov>, Roger Healy <roger.healy@juneau.org>, Sam Hatch <sam.hatch@juneau.ak.gov>, "Sara Race" (sara.race@juneau.ak.gov), "Scott Heaton" (scott.heaton@juneau.ak.gov), "Shaub, Thyes" <shaub@juneau.ak.gov>, "Staton, Donna" <donna.staton@juneau.ak.gov>, "Steininger, Al" <al.steinger@juneau.ak.gov>, "Timothy, Jackie" <jackie.timothy@juneau.ak.gov>, Tom Mattice <Tom.Mattice@juneau.org>, "Traci Heaton" (traci.heaton@juneau.ak.gov), "White, Ben" <ben.white@juneau.ak.gov>
Subject: Re: LID Ballot

My fellow neighbors:

Here is why I am voting no, and hope that everyone considers doing the same.

There are really only about 10 properties in need right now, and I am not one of them.

While I empathize for my fellow neighbors, spreading the cost equally amongst the 28 of us is not fair. I think that a proportionate payment to the amount of work would be a more equitable way to split the cost.

Nico, this is nothing against you or your immediate neighbors, and I do appreciate you taking the lead and giving some history on this research, however I feel that if these emails are going to be on the CBJ record, then the record should be made clear.

You stated that at the last meeting the neighbors all voted to pursue the project with CBJ. But one thing you failed to put on the record is that 13 of the property owners were not represented. So while 15 of you may have agreed, and yes some others who did not attend later voiced their support, a lot of the "no voters" in the initial survey were not in attendance or were not informed of the meeting. We did not have a chance to voice our concerns, thus giving everyone an opportunity to "sway" some of the swing votes (so to speak).

I would also like to know how it is that you were given the results of the initial ballots that were submitted last

fall? I assumed these ballots would be confidential and for the CBJ Assembly members consideration only, and was quite shocked to see that the votes of each neighbor were disclosed to you and then later to the group.

Your comment about where did the 28 come from is a good comment, as I was wondering the same. Why only 28? Or why so many? Both questions could be and should be asked and answered by NRCS.

CBJ has no obligation to reduce our property assessments based on this project, and given the fact that they have stated they will be charging us interest on the 15 year lien, and including an admin fee, I think it's safe to say that they are in this for two reasons, to improve the river access property that they own (a direct benefit to them without any cost) and to make some money by assigning someone to facilitate these discussion and manage the project.

My fellow neighbors, remember that you cannot just back out and decide you don't want to pay! Once the LID is formed - the Lien will be put in place!! So, before you hastily vote yes thinking it's our only option, please know that you don't have to be bullied into supporting this project, if you are opposed to it (like I am) as presented, I urge you to vote NO on the ballot and show up to testify at the assembly meeting when they and only they will decide our fate.

Danielle Lindoff

On Apr 26, 2017, at 3:51 PM, Nico Bus [REDACTED] wrote:

Greetings,

I appreciate Curt and Danielle's position, however there are many points to be made. None of us like to spend \$78,000 on a riverbank. I had to spend \$25,000, 20 years ago, to harden my riverbank as it was getting to be like it is now at Flores', Jaeger's, Staton's, and Wagner's.

Curt's point about the value of the property is an important one! Without a restoration project, most all of our properties lose value. With a project that protects the riverbank and our homes we will have the chance to sell our homes. Without strengthening your riverbank you will lose value as an honest realtor or homeowner now needs to disclose the erosion problem (and the cost to fix it).

To put things in perspective Wagner's and Staton's tried to go it alone and use a local engineering firm about two years ago and at that time the project cost for each of their property was more than \$150,000!!! That's when Norm Staton talked to the CBJ's Tom Mattice and Tom got the NRCS involved. All their work to-date have been at no charge to the homeowners.

The project as designed by NRCS is very solid, and yes expensive. It is up to us homeowners to work with, challenge the cost, and explore alternatives. I volunteered to coordinate communications for the impacted neighbors. After the earlier mtg with the CBJ and the NRCS we did challenge the CBJ cost of \$700.0 and they were honest and said it was high and now in their new estimate it is lower and it dropped the estimate per property from \$125.0 to \$78.0.

I think it is important that the impacted neighbors work as a group, which means that you need coordination and agreement. The CBJ and their LID process will force this. From my personal experience in trying to convince neighbors to work together on a project like this, first in 1996 and now in 2016 and 2017, it does not work. There are many reasons for neighbors not agreeing on a project like this. I worked for DNR in 1996 so I had all the resources and connections to make it a success, yet only one neighbor agreed to go in with me to protect the riverbank in our riverbend.

Forward 20 years and what I predicted in 1996 happened in 2015 and 2016 and the upstream properties

from our home started to fail. Initially both Wagner's and Staton's bank failed badly. Jaeger's and Flores' did not look too bad and seemed like they were not in danger. Then came the 2016 summer season and the river took big chunks out of not only the Wagner and Staton's property but then it went upstream and started to eat on Jaeger's and Flores' property and possibly Rud's. Ironically when Jaegers and Flores applied for emergency permit to strengthen their bank and hopefully avoid having their homes fall into the river in the 2017 summer season, the Wagners and Staton decided not to participate and wait till the NRCS/CBJ project was decided. Their right to make that decision - but now you have a very dangerous situation in that if the river takes too much of their property then the downstream neighbors (Buness and Bus) will be negatively impacted, even though these properties did spend their money in 1996 to add much rock, which is mostly still there, with the comment that it is not clear how much remains and how strong their "toe" (the section below the water mark) is.

The advantage of the NRCS/CBJ project is that they did all the engineering and surveying. Their design is very solid and much better than what Jaeger and Flores just spent ~\$30.0 each on.

The questions to ask are why the 28 properties - The Lindoffs are at the very start of the project and feel they could be excluded as they are gaining land. All others have varying degrees of impacts. This may change significantly this summer again.

When we met last all of us agreed to take it to the next step and work with the CBJ/NRCS. The LID process will make it more formal and some may change their mind when it comes to signing on the bottom-line.

I for one do not want to spend \$78.0, but when comparing to going it alone - like the Wagners and Statons tried to do 2 years ago - think it is much cheaper as we will have the benefit of the NRCS Federal grant.

The big question is what to do if we do not get the federal grant.??

I will be back in Juneau this Sunday and eb willing to get another neighbor meeting together to discuss options.

Nico

[Quoted text hidden]



Fwd: LID Ballot

2 messages

Danielle Lindoff <[REDACTED]@yahoo.com>

Wed, May 3, 2017 at 10:53 AM

Danielle Lindoff

Begin forwarded message:

From: Danielle Lindoff <daniellelindoff@yahoo.com>

Date: April 26, 2017 at 7:15:24 AM AKDT

To: curt goehring <securtg@gmail.com>

Cc: "Nelson, Brett - NRCS, Palmer, AK" (brett.nelson@ak.usda.gov) <brett.nelson@ak.usda.gov>, "Al & JoAnn Steininger" ([REDACTED]), Andy and Joshua Hamilton <[REDACTED]>, "Bjorn Wolter" ([REDACTED]), "Bonnett, Louis & Edith" <[REDACTED]>, Borough Assembly <BoroughAssembly@juneau.org>, "Brian Goettler" ([REDACTED]), "Bud Jaeger" <[REDACTED]>, "Carla White" ([REDACTED]), "Edwardson, Rob" <rob.edwardson@akleg.gov>, "Egan, Dennis" <Senator.Dennis.Egan@akleg.gov>, "Egan, Dennis & Margaret" <[REDACTED]>, Greg Wagner <[REDACTED]>, "Heidi & John Boucher" ([REDACTED]), Jeff Rud <[REDACTED]>, Joe Flores <[REDACTED]>, "Joe Heueisen & Joyce Mill" ([REDACTED]), John Bohan <John.Bohan@juneau.org>, "John Taber" ([REDACTED]), Justin Parish <representative.Justin.Parish@akleg.gov>, "Kito, Sam" <Representative.Sam.Kito@akleg.gov>, Loretta Neal <[REDACTED]>, Lucy & Bill Hudson <[REDACTED]>, Matt Mickle <[REDACTED]>, Michael & Jodi Wise <[REDACTED]>, Norman Staton <[REDACTED]>, Ray & Sheri Vidic <[REDACTED]>, Rhonda Bunes <[REDACTED]>, Roger Healy <roger.healy@juneau.org>, Sam Hatch <[REDACTED]>, "Sara Race" ([REDACTED]), "Scott Heaton" ([REDACTED]), "Shaub, Thyes" <[REDACTED]>, "Staton, Donna" <[REDACTED]>, "Steininger, Al" <[REDACTED]>, "Timothy, Jackie" <jackie.timothy@alaska.gov>, Tom Mattice <Tom.Mattice@juneau.org>, "Traci Heaton" ([REDACTED]), "White, Ben" <[REDACTED]>, Nico Bus <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Re: LID Ballot

Thank you Curt!

Finally a voice of reason!!

I too will be voting no!

I would also like to know how it is that CBJ has added in an administrative fee.

I also feel my property shouldn't even be in there in the first place.

I am drafting my extensive response of why we should all vote no on this and will be sending it out.

Danielle Lindoff

On Apr 25, 2017, at 7:56 PM, curt goehring <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Fellow neighbors:

[REDACTED]

You may have noticed the "Informal Ballots" were in today's mail. We are sending out this email to voice our opinion as to why we intend to vote NO on the formation of an LID to improve the riverbank, and encourage other homeowners to do likewise.

1. First and foremost, there was NEVER any alternative resolution pursued by the group. We're not even sure how the CBJ and NRCS got involved as our only solution in the first place. We recently contacted JNP Engineering, a Juneau firm, and asked if they could provide us with a second opinion on how to mitigate the river erosion problem. They have extensive experience in erosion and waterway construction and said they would be happy to review the CBJ/NRCS proposal. If the LID process fails, we're nowhere close to pursuing any other solutions. Putting all our faith in the CBJ/NRCS proposal is risky at best. There are no alternatives in place and we strongly recommend we, as homeowners, pursue other options.

2. We vehemently oppose all homeowners being forced into an (approx.) \$80,000 lien on our properties. Of course, we feel terrible for those who have had serious erosion the past several years, but do not feel the proper way to address the issue is to negatively impact 28 properties. To say the work "needs to be done to prevent our property from erosion" is like saying "I should quit my job today, because I MIGHT win the lottery tomorrow." It is ludicrous to essentially hand over a blank check and agree to the LID, not knowing what the total dollar figure will end up being. If the costs go up, we sit back and take an even bigger hit on the value of our homes. This money will never be recouped. Having a re-inforced riverbank will NOT increase our property value, in fact, the loss of our beautiful backyards would likely bring home values down even more.

There have been a couple of comments by "out-of-towners" whose only interest in this stems from their rental properties along the river. They are happy to go along with the LID because they can use the cost as a "tax write-off". Nice for them. Not so nice for the rest of us.

3. We bought this house next to the river to enjoy the beautiful backyard and view that came along with it. By the time this LID goes through and the work is completed, we will ALL be left with the following:

a. NO trees along the riverbank in our backyards, nothing but a sterile environment right up to our houses.

b. Little, to no backyard space, if any.

c. Nothing but grey rocks right outside our back doors, AND...

d. A chain link fence between us, and the river. Most likely installed at the top of the slope, which means we'll have a fence directly outside our back doors. There will no longer be public access by any of us to the river.

THIS is not why we chose to live here!

4. Last and certainly not least, our property values will take an immediate and devastating hit. Everyone's property value will instantly be reduced by (approx.) \$80,000. Anyone not planning to stay here permanently will have to pay the LID lien in full, as part of any closing costs, should you try to sell.

I also wonder how the retired folks living along the river can cover the lien (an assessment of \$10,000 per year) on a fixed income.

We have attended almost every meeting. Unfortunately, we were out of state when the last one took place. We have been taking this all in and have expressed concerns at previous meetings just to have them swept under the carpet.

There has to be another way. Two of the homeowner's up-river from us put \$25,000 each into "emergency" repairs which cost will be for naught should this LID and NRCS project occur. Their money will have been wasted. At the original meeting a member proposed forming a non-profit Homeowner's Association which we've strongly suggested since, and all homeowners commit to contributing a reasonable amount to assist those homeowners most adversely affected by river erosion and perhaps improve other at-risk properties riverbanks.

Remediation must occur to help affected homeowners and prepare for additional future erosion problems and we obviously need to do SOMETHING! But forcing everyone into an exorbitant and unknown monetary obligation for the next 10 years is not the solution.

One last note. We have heard several times that the CBJ owns two of the properties included in the 28 along the river. Have those properties, i.e. CBJ, been assessed the same amount of funds as all other homeowners? We propose CBJ not be allowed to vote pertaining to the formation of the LID for those properties. They stand to profit approx. \$100,000 if the LID goes through, which appears to be a direct conflict of interest.

With all of this in mind, we encourage each of you to consider voting against the LID. We welcome comments and suggestions.

Sincerely,

Curt and Joyce Goehring
3361 Meander Way













