

The following is a summary of the common issues heard at the three public meetings held on October 14, October 18, and October 28. Full summaries of each meeting are provided under separate cover.

Public Vote. Many participants felt that there should be a public vote on flood district formation, specifically because the district will have taxing authority. They were also concerned that cities and towns would not have representation on the flood district.

Flood reduction project costs. Participants said they wanted to know more about the projects before a district was formed and what they cost before they are asked to help pay for them. Questions were asked about moving people out of the flood plain instead of building infrastructure.

Concern about infrastructure projects. Participants were concerned about the cost and environmental impacts of large scale infrastructure projects. The cost of these projects would be extremely high and would place a large burden on those who have to pay for them. Participants wanted to know more about potential non-structural solutions.

Flood reduction project benefits. In general, participants said that they don't want to pay to address problems if they are not contributing to them.

Types of project revenue levies. Participants asked a number of questions about how money could be raised to pay for flood reduction projects, whether the District could use a combination of taxes, rates and levies to raise money. They were concerned that the District would try to raise the maximum amount possible through these methods. They were concerned about fairness and whether those that helped cause problems, or who would benefit the most, would pay a larger share. There was a general belief that flood problems are caused by "others" or the flood problems could be "lived with".

Land use concerns. Participants expressed doubt that the flooding problems could really be fixed; that it would be necessary to remove all buildings from the floodplain. They don't want to pay to fix problems caused by questionable land use decisions.

Flood district boundaries. Participants had a number of questions about the flood district boundary— how it was developed and how it will be approved. Participants were generally concerned that those within the boundary should benefit from flood reduction projects and programs.

Public meeting notification. Participants were concerned by the low turnout, and said that while there may be some public apathy, more effort needed to go into public outreach. They said that it was especially important for people to know about this process because they might be asked to pay taxes or rates to help pay for projects. They suggested that school reader boards, radio and newspaper advertising, and a larger mailing should be used to notify the public.