

Planning Department

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on Title 21. Also, thank you to all of the individuals who have taken on the task of this code rewrite project. It's clear that it will not be possible to achieve total community consensus on all the issues, but I believe it will be possible to find middle ground on many of the most important issues.

Citizens made it clear as they developed the vision for Anchorage 2020, that they value Anchorage's natural open space and wildlife habitat, and they want to protect these wild places for future generations. Title 21 is a crucial ordinance for the quality of life in Anchorage. It must balance the needs and interests of Anchorage's diverse population, and permit development while maintaining the unique character of our city.

The 2005 Public Draft #1 severely weakens or eliminates whole sections, the intent and language found in the 2004 Draft Module III needs to be restored in the following sections:

Public Open Space Dedication (Chapter 21.07.030 B)

Public open space requirements have been completely removed. Private open space set asides have been reduced and industrial development is no longer required to set aside open space.

I urge the MOA Planning Department to put back the deleted sections from 2004 Draft Module III that deal with Public and Private open space. Title 21 should also require the dedication of a public pedestrian easement for a trail or access point to Chugach State Park as identified in the most current Chugach State Park Access Inventory, or trail plan.

Tree Retention (Chapter 21.07.020 G)

Tree retention has been greatly reduced and moved to 21.07.080 Landscaping, screening, and fences section; tree retention is now an option, rather than a requirement

I urge the MOA Planning Department to put back the deleted sections from 2004 Draft Module III that deal with Tree Retention

Wildlife Habitat Protection (Chapter 21.07.020 E)

All you've addressed in the 2005 draft seems to be "conflicts". Addressing conflicts is fine, but not enough. Wildlife obviously represents more to Anchorage than conflicts. 2005 Draft - does contain small sections on wildlife habitat but as a whole, they are completely inadequate to protect wildlife or habitats in Anchorage.

I urge the MOA Planning Department to put back the deleted sections from 2004 Draft Module III that deal with wildlife habitat protection back into Title 21.

Stream, Water Body and Wetland Protection (Chapter 21.07.020 B) Most of our streams in Anchorage are currently listed on the EPA's 303(d) impaired water body list for fecal coliform contamination which is a result of urban runoff. This contamination is indicative of non-point

source pollution that can be reduced by an increase in the riparian buffer area.

In section 21.07.020 (B)(4)(a)(iii) I recommend that the requirement be changed from 25 feet to 50 feet.

In section 21.07.020 (B)(6)(b) I recommend that the Department remove the language "to the maximum extent feasible". This language weakens the code by not defining who will determine the maximum extent feasible.

At a minimum, there should be comprehensive public workshops to resolve the differences between the 2004 and 2005 Drafts Title 21, similar to the workshops that created the vision of Anchorage 2020.

In general I continue to see examples in the municipality of Anchorage, and more specifically in my own neighborhood along Hiland Road in Eagle River, a regular disregard to basic water quality set backs and riparian zone protection, and building directly in steep slopes of the river ravine that demonstrate that current enforcement of regulations consistent with the Clean Water Act is not sufficient to protect surface waters and wildlife habitat. It is time to not only retain our current protections, but also to more effectively enforce them.

Thank you again for this opportunity to respond.

Suzanne Marcy
3349 Hiland Road
Eagle River, AK 99577