

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

**Minutes of the Public Hearing
Denali Borough Planning Commission
Tri-Valley Community Center
June 19, 2012**

Call to Order: Deputy Presiding Officer, Anne CAPISTRANT, called the Planning Commission Public Hearing to order at 7:15 PM.

Commissioners: Planning Commission members present were Anne CAPISTRANT, Patricia GRIGGS, Mark MENKE, Molly MCKINLEY, and Rick WEIBEL. Steve JONES, Sid MICHAELS, and Bill MITCHELL were absent.

1. **Draft 4 Chapter 4.10 Management of Borough Real Property**

There were no public comments on this item.

2. **Draft 4 Chapter 4.15 Disposal of Borough Real Property**

There were no public comments on this item.

3. **Draft 11 Chapter 4.25 Classification of Borough-owned Land**

Hannah Ragland of Panguingue Creek Subdivision

Ms. Ragland apologized for not producing additional written comments on this item, but stated that written comments will be submitted. Ms. Ragland stated that she wished to reiterate some of her comments that have been made in the past and to note some observations regarding the rewrite of this chapter.

1. The planning commission was encouraged to review the **definitions** in the current code for rural residential and town site. More specifics, i.e. lot sizes, and provisions are contained in the code that are lacking in the proposed rewrite.
2. Referencing prior discussions on where to place **agriculture** within the context of the rewrite, Ms. Ragland suggested that perhaps it should be placed in two of the three land classifications: Resource Development and/or Management and Settlement and/or Development. She continued that it would not be inappropriate to place a land use under more than one classification. She furthered that agriculture can take place on both large and small tracts of land.
3. The **definition for settlement** includes the term development and thus, the word development should be dropped from the classification's heading.
4. The code now reads that land must be classified prior to any action taken that affects that land; the rewrite states that only land that is to be disposed of needs to be classified. Taking into account that temporary land use permits are being considered for exclusive use of borough property, it seems reasonable to **classify land** prior to allowing an exclusive use.
5. Existing material sites, right-of-ways for transportation and electricity, nor existing grazing and agricultural leases are currently listed as a classification in the revision. Ms. Ragland proposed that some mechanism be put in place to allow for preexisting uses to continue if properties are transferred to the borough.
6. Ms. Ragland stated that she is curious to see the Denali Borough **Fee Schedule**. In the present code, there is no fee for a member of the public to propose a tract of land to be classified in a certain way. It should remain that way or the fee should be minimal since it is a public process. Considering the lack

1 of public participation in commission business, it would seem prudent to not hinder potential public
2 involvement because of fees being implemented to participate in the public process.

- 3 7. In the code, there is opportunity for the **private landowner** to introduce their personal property for
4 classification. This opportunity has been deleted in the rewrite of the chapter.
5 8. The public process procedures for land classification seem to be more restrictive in the rewrite than
6 what is in code now. The Findings of Fact should specifically and precisely clarify that it includes public
7 input.
8 9. Code presently states that at least one **public hearing** will be scheduled; the rewrite states one public
9 hearing will be scheduled. It is recommended that the phrase "at least" remain in the new language. It
10 is good to have multiple meetings and it is good to have a meeting in the affected area.
11 10. The code states "planning commission will classify land based on the administrator's
12 recommendations, **public input**, and other considerations." The rewrite does not reference public
13 input as a basis for a decision on classification.

14
15 Ms. Ragland reiterated that she would submit her ideas in writing. She stated she hopes the commission finds
16 some of these thoughts helpful. Ms. Ragland concluded by expressing her appreciation for all the work the
17 commission has done on this chapter.
18

19 **4. DNR – ADL 419038 and ADL 419270 – Antler Creek Gravel Pit expansion and new master material site/Mile**
20 **245 Parks Highway**

21 **Hannah Ragland of Panguingue Creek Subdivision**

22 Ms. Ragland stated she appreciated the Mayor's hesitancy in creating new or expanding existing gravel pits.
23 There are a number of industrial developments and highway improvement projects going on in the borough,
24 which provides the commission with an opportunity to scrutinize existing and proposed gravel permits for
25 cumulative impacts. The Alaska Stand Alone Pipeline project proposes to extract an enormous amount of gravel
26 throughout the Denali Borough. Ms. Ragland expressed support for the commission commenting to the
27 Department of Natural Resources about the Antler Creek gravel pit expansion.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 **Adjournment:** The Deputy Presiding Officer closed the Planning Commission Public Hearing @ 7:25 PM.
38

39
40 APPROVED: *Sidney W. Michaels*
41 Presiding Officer

42
43 ATTEST: *Linda L. Paganini*
44 Deputy Clerk

45
46
47 Date Approved: *July 17, 2012*
48