

# **DESK PACKET**

**(MATERIALS SUBMITTED AFTER MEETING PACKET PUBLICATION)**

## **MISC. INFORMATION**

- **09-04-24 Cooper Landing APC Meeting Minutes**
- **09-05-24 Moose Pass APC Meeting Minutes**

**COOPER LANDING ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING  
LOCATION: COOPER LANDING COMMUNITY HALL AND ZOOM  
TELECONFERENCE  
WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 04, 2024  
6:00 PM  
UNAPPROVED MINUTES**

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. ROLL CALL -
  - a. J. Cadieux, K. Recken, Y. Galbraith, C. Degernes, L. Johnson, D. Story present. H. Harrison excused.
  - b. In person attendees: Lorraine Temple, Marja Beltrami, Sandra Holsten, Ed Holsten, Joe Arnone, Aaron Hughes – KPB Land Management Officer
  - c. Attending by Zoom: Morgan Aldridge – KPB Planning Department; Robert Ruffner, KPB Planning Director; Sharon Kocher, Kristine Route, Cindy Ecklund – KPB Assembly, Mona Painter
3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA -
  - a. Y. Galbraith requested to add Joe Arnone – Biochar Wildfire Defense Grant
    - i. L. Johnson moves to approve as amended, J. Cadieux seconds. All approve by roll call vote.
4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES for June 5, 2024 Regular Meeting
  - a. K. Recken moves to approve as written. L. Johnson seconds. All approve by roll call vote excepting J. Cadieux who was not present at the June meeting.
5. BOROUGH BUSINESS
  - a. REPORTS: PLANNING – Aaron Hughes, KPB Land Management Officer
    - i. A. Hughes said that the KPB was not awarded the second round of USFS Community Wildfire Defense grants but the KPB will attempt for the third round of funding.
    - ii. He said there is an existing BLM grant for \$74,000. Some funds being spent through Chugachmiut working on beetle kill remediation including areas in Cooper Landing: CL Emergency Services, CL Transfer Site, Snug Harbor Materials Site and CL School. CLES and the School will be dealt with before the transfer and material sites.
    - iii. He said contracts for beetle kill remediation are also being paid through a \$1.5 million USFS grant which will includes improvements to and facilitation of slash disposal sites and pile burning.
    - iv. He said the KPB has finalized Memorandums of Agreement with Chugach Electric and Homer Electric for mitigation of beetle kill including standards of work.

- a He described some of the criteria including reducing the height of slash in treated areas to approximately 18” and ensuring ground contact.
  - v. J. Cadieux asked if the contractors are aware of the setback of Dena’ina Creek for the transfer site work.
    - a A. Hughes said yes.
  - vi. J. Cadieux asked how does leaving slash in place reduce the fire risk?
    - a A. Hughes said by bucking the trees in certain dimensions and ensuring ground contact it helps promote decomposition.
    - b K. Recken mentioned the left-over slash and how it remains a risk far longer than it seems like is planned for.
  - vii. C. Degernes asked about whether it makes sense for the community to weigh in on what needs are to support the grant applications.
    - a R. Ruffner said that at the grant writing stage it doesn’t make as much sense as having input once a grant is awarded.
  - viii. M. Beltrami said that a concern with the left-over slash piles can make it very difficult for CLES to access areas to provide emergency services.
  - ix. R. Ruffner said that the protocols for treatment are based on recommendations of fire experts including those involved in the All Hands, All Lands program.
  - x. S. Holsten said that it seems like everyone is really trying but there may still be missed areas to connect and shared with A. Hughes to follow up on including KPB land on Snug Harbor Road.
- 2. Update on Quartz Creek Municipal Entitlement Survey
  - i. A. Hughes said the area is 300-ish acres.
  - ii. He said the property was selected by the KPB but is still held by the state and that the KPB must survey it before they can take possession of the lands.
    - a He said it is a time-consuming process and doing so includes receiving survey instructions, finding a contractor, initial review by state, review by borough, then finally comes back to be patented.
    - b He said there are many lands in the Cooper Landing area and near Moose Pass that still need to go through this process.
  - iii. C. Degernes asked whether survey instructions have been received.
    - a A. Hughes said yes and that the selection of a 300-acre unit means surveying all the individual units, section corners, and property boundaries within this unit.
  - iv. L. Temple asked what the purpose of the lands is when selected.

- a A. Hughes said that right now it is just to transfer it into KPB ownership.
- v. J. Cadiuex asked about habitat setbacks along Quartz Creek.
  - a A. Hughes said they are incorporated.
- vi. Y. Galbraith asked if this unit goes across the highway.
  - a A. Hughes said yes, it does go across the highway near the transfer station and towards the Russian Gap area.
- vii. C. Degernes said it would be helpful to have updates with progress.
- viii. K. Recken asked if it would be possible to see a map of the lands that have been chosen and if it is visible on the parcel viewer.
  - a A. Hughes said that it is not on the parcel viewer right now and is not sure whether a map of the selection has been provided to the APC.
- ix. J. Cadioux reiterated that it would be helpful to see some of these maps.
  - a A. Hughes said that it is a huge undertaking to go through this process and it will come before the APC again.
- x. D. Story asked if the land selection maps can be made available in the support documents for this meeting.
  - a A. Hughes said that seems possible.
  - b C. Degernes suggested that M. Aldridge may be able to post them to the APC site in supporting documents.

b. PLATTING

1. NEW PLATS: - none

2. ANY NOTICE OF DECISION ON PLATS - none

6. OLD BUSINESS - none

7. NEW BUSINESS - none

8. PUBLIC COMMENT/PRESENTATION

a. “Community Council” concept – discussion for future of Cooper Landing APC, Robert Ruffner, Kenai Peninsula Borough Planning Director

- i. R. Ruffner said in mid-July he got together with all the existing APC chairs and vice chairs. He said the APCs have a long history and Cooper Landing’s APC has the longest. Through that history it has varied in how it was utilized. The issues we hear are: that it is difficult to schedule meetings and remain compliant with Open Meetings Act; the topics that communities hope to cover are broader scope than APCs can take on since their scope is defined by KPB code and limited to items that will be addressed by the KPB Planning Commission only. He said this discussion is to determine if there is a desire to take up topics and have a venue that works to address things the APCs cannot?

- ii. He said the idea is to find if there is a better way to accomplish these goals and right now is the start of this conversation to find out what options exist.
- iii. C. Degernes asked Mona Painter to be here because she has the longest history with the APC and the Community Club.
  - a. M. Painter said she has been thinking about this for some time. There was discussion some years back about this conversion of the CLCC to a community council model. There was also discussion of incorporating the community. It may not have gone far then because it wasn't clear what the next steps were to take.
  - b. She said that the idea is good to have a council that can talk about varied topics that a model like the APC cannot: example USFS lands etc.
- iv. Y. Galbraith said that the CLCC has a lot on its plate and was given more to do when the KPB formalized that items that had traditionally been handled by the CLAPC were outside the scope of APCs and ended it as a venue for those items. She suggested that a Community Council be established in addition to the existing APC and CLCC.
- v. K. Recken said that she understood the CLCC to be socially oriented originally but that there are a lot of issues that affect the community that need to be addressed. M Painter indicated it was initially social items but others as well.
- vi. E. Holsten said that the CLAPC has been phenomenal for planning since the 90's. He said his concern is that this strength will be diluted further and that it has already happened.
- vii. D. Story said that he agreed with E. Holsten that the CLAPC had been very valuable to the community as a venue for many issues and brought up the gravel and firewood forums and other examples. He said that the community benefits from a venue to interface with the KPB, USFS, SoA and other agencies and that some of that dilution has already happened because the way the CLAPC had traditionally functioned is not the way that APCs are supposed to. He said that there appears to be merit in a structure similar to the community council models [Mat-Su and ANC] shared in the supporting documents which define the function of the councils and the responsibilities the KPB would have to the councils.
- viii. S. Holsten said that her biggest concern is that community councils often become political which can put folk at odds with each other. She said that every organization is starving for volunteers and that one of the very valuable aspects of the existing APC is the tenure of the members which allows them to learn and know more about the processes and relationships between agencies and land management

- etc.. She said that one idea is that the APC would form a subcommittee to determine how a council might work.
- ix. K. Recken said that she agrees with S. Holsten that the knowledge is important. She said that it takes at least a three-year commitment because shorter time often doesn't allow a deep enough understanding to deal with the issues.
  - x. C. Ecklund said that for as long as she sat on the Planning Commission she appreciated the input and doesn't see the mechanism for input in the articles of the MatSu and ANC community councils. She asked R. Ruffner about this.
1. R. Ruffner said this is still very exploratory but that the things that are challenging for an APC, when you have multiple issues come up, it requires multiple KPB staff to answer questions which is a challenge for his staff.
    - xi. L. Johnson said she agrees with S. Holsten and stated emphatically that the last thing we need is a third group.
    - xii. E. Holsten said that our APC seems to be working very well. He asked why it doesn't work for other communities.
    - xiii. S. Holsten said that she understands the challenge of the meeting scheduling.
    - xiv. D. Story said that to touch on C. Ecklund's comment, the mechanisms to provide input are listed within the ANC and Mat-Su's Community Council Codes [Mat-Su: 2.76.050 Functions of Community Councils and 2.76.060 Municipal Responsibilities, ANC 2.40.050 Functions and 2.40.60 Municipal Responsibilities to community councils]
    - xv. Y. Galbraith said that she doesn't want to put more responsibilities on the existing CLCC because they already have so much on their hands.
    - xvi. K. Recken asked about the formulation of this concept and if there would be a community club and an APC or if it would be a whole new beast.
  1. R. Ruffner said that they were looking for a way to allow for the APC to take up things that affect the community that code does not allow an APC to do right now. He said they were really thinking about how to fix the APCs while managing with limited staff to cover all the needs. He said that there is not a predetermined outcome.
    - xvii. L. Temple asked how the CLCC is different in addressing the KPB from a community council.
      - a. R. Ruffner said that the CLCC can address the KPB right now. The APC can only advise the KPB PC. He said that the community councils build relationship over time through credibility. He said he was not looking for a club, a council, and an APC and that it never crossed his mind for adding another.
    - xviii. J. Cadieux said what she is hearing from R. Ruffner is that the KPB is unable to serve the communities the way that it wants to. She said that

when the CLAPC was more involved with additional topics it may have demanded more work from the KPB staff than it does now. Opening up a council model may, in fact, require more work from the KPB staff.

- xix. S. Holsten said that she knows that the KPB staff are incredibly dedicated. She said that if those staff are not integrated with the community councils it could become even more difficult for them.
- 1. R. Ruffner said he is concerned about how to better deliver services. He said that in the past there were only 1-2 active APCs and now there are seven.
- xx. C. Degernes asked what he needs from the community as this process moves forward.
- 1. He said he hopes to convene a meeting with the chairs and vice chairs later this fall to hear whether they feel it has merit and why or whether everyone is happy to stay with the same system.
- xxi. L. Temple said that one of the important differences between the Mat-Su and ANC areas is the population and number of potential volunteers.
- xxii. J. Cadieux asked whether the KPB had replaced the KPB Planner.
  - a. A. Hughes said that he is unfamiliar with that role.
  - b. J. Cadieux said it had previously been someone specifically knowledgeable/degree-trained in planning issues.
- xxiii. M. Beltrami said that she understands how the CLAPC came to be but she wonders what formal relationship to the borough exists.
- 1. D. Story said that the APCs have a formal relationship with the KPB Planning Commission but that the scope of the APCs is very limited.
- 2. M. Beltrami asked what would be lost?
- xxiv. D. Story said that the functionality of the APC and CLCC is what needs to be determined. He said that community needs were often dealt with through the APC rather than the CLCC and that while the CLCC is working to adapt to fill those needs now it is still catching its stride to do so.
- xxv. C. Degernes suggested that we talk with neighbors and prepare for the conversation with a wider group of people and find out what we want to see happen.

## 9. PUBLIC COMMENT/PRESENTATION

- a. Joe Arnone – Biochar Wildfire Defense Grant J. Arnone said he is a new property owner in Cooper Landing. He has been managing a business in Montana that is a biorefinery to create biochar.
  - i. He said he has spoken to KPB, USFS, etc. to develop a way to do something other than burn the slash from beetle kill remediation.
  - ii. He said while looking at grant programs it appears they cannot qualify for them as a for-profit business so wondered about whether other entities might be able to partner and qualify for their own grants.

- iii. He said he found a property owner on K-Beach Road who is excited by the biochar idea and may be willing to use his land to facilitate it.
- iv. C. Degernes asked what biochar is.
  - a. J. Arnone said that it is a super charcoal. He said it helps soil organisms, retention of water, and filtration.
- v. Y. Galbraith asked what the KPB's response was for this project.
  - a. J. Arnone said they seemed excited and would like to see a wood chip study.
- vi. J. Cadieux asked whether they have worked in an anadromous environment previously?
  - a. J. Arnone said not really.
  - b. She said the work that he describes to retrieve the slash can have negative impacts such as siltation and resource destruction and care would need to be taken in developing a plan for action.
- vii. D. Story asked what happens with the biochar after produced.
  - a. J. Arnone said it isn't really profitable to sell so it is intended to return it to the community or give it away.
- viii. J. Arnone said you can learn more at RJOBMT.com and the business with the refinery is Regenitech.
  - a. He said the developer of the process was featured in the documentary "The Need to Grow."
- ix. C. Degernes said that she sees this as a very important topic to share with the Community Club.
- b. S. Holsten said that she and J. Cadieux were given a tour of the MP 45-60 project and that the DOT would like to take the CLAPC and the CLCC Board on a tour of the MP 45-60 project.
  - i. She has since worked with the Governor's office.
  - ii. She said that the goal is also to have a tour for the community in the spring.
  - iii. J. Cadieux said that the tour really helped address concerns that she had about hydrologic issues in a way that previous community meetings had not. She would like others to have their questions answered in this way as well.
- c. C. Ecklund said that it is important to compare and contrast the KPB Code regarding APCs [KPB 21.02] to the Community Council codes that were provided in the meeting.

10. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS - none

11. ADJOURNMENT

- a. L. Johnson moves to adjourn, J. Cadieux seconds. All approve by roll call vote.  
7:58pm



For more information or to submit comments please contact:

Contact the Cooper Landing APC at:

- For email visit: <https://www.kpb.us/planning-dept/planning-commissions/cooper-landing-apc>  
On the far right-hand side of the page is a box titled, "Commissioner Information". Scroll to the bottom of the box and select, "Contact the Cooper Landing APC".
- Send USPS mail to: Kenai Peninsula Borough Planning Department, Attn: CLAPC 144 N Binkley, Soldotna, AK 99669

# MOOSE PASS ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

## REGULAR MEETING

LOCATION: MOOSE PASS SPORTSMAN CLUB AND ZOOM

TELECONFERENCE THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 5, 2024

6:00 P.M.

### Unapproved Meeting Minutes

Jennifer Boyle, Kevin Dunham, Jeff Estes, Jeff Hetrick, Bruce Jaffa, David Pearson, Dave Schafer

To join the meeting from a computer, visit <https://us06web.zoom.us/j/9360805262>. To attend the Zoom meeting by telephone, call toll-free **1-888-788-0099** or **1-877-853-5247** and enter the **Meeting ID 9360805262**. If you connect by computer and do not have speakers or a microphone, connect online and then select phone for audio. A box will come up with a toll free numbers, the Meeting ID, and your participant number. You may join the meeting physically at the Moose Pass Sportsman Club, 33675 Depot Road, Moose Pass, AK 99631

1. CALL TO ORDER - 6:05pm
2. ROLL CALL - all present
3. **Citizen Comments** - Jeff Estes - Would like to have Lawing Airport raised or leveled as was discussed in 2018 with gravel from QAP from current QAP project, Nancy Erickson - when go past horse pasture on mountain side when heading north, no guard rail being added and needs to be as she has seen cars that have left the road in the area, DOT not planning on adding one
4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA - Dave P motions, Jeff H 2nds. Approved.
5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
  - a. June 6, 2024 - Dave S to send to Julie.
6. NEW BUSINESS
  - a. Conditional Land Use Permit Modification; MS2022-004  
Applicant: Colaska Inc. DBA QAP  
Request: Modification to PC Resolution 2022-21 to expand the permit area, additional ingress/egress, and create a 100' wide access to the ARRCC ROW Location: 27083 Seward Highway

Dave P makes motion to support, 2nd Jeff H

**Vote is unanimous to oppose; all members present.**

From Julie - Public comments due tomorrow 9/6 by 1pm for the KPB

Ryan Raymay, Planner with KPB, Material Science presentation. Staff report supports approval. He has received written comments about ongoing violations. If resolution is not found between Robert Roughner and QAP by the time of the planning commission

meeting on Monday, September 9th will recommend postponement of this modification.

Planning commission looks at loading train cars and trucks as the same thing. There are no ordinances on times of day for loading.

Modification is for next 5 years with the ability to renew.

Discussion:

Public Comments:

Gary Glasgow - property next to the material site area. QAP has already removed trees without permission (violation) resulting in additional noise from the material site. In regard to railroad ingress/egress, already cut trees to the perimeter of the material site. Want to extend that to 100 ft wide. How much material are they moving? What is the noise level expected? What are the dates that this is happening? Hours of operation? How many cars to be loaded? Will access to private properties be blocked? He has concerns about additional ingress/egress requests. One of his biggest concerns is the addition of the 2 parcels. At this time QAP is leasing the parcels. But how can you approve a condition LUP on a leased piece of property?

Bonnie Bryer- She lives just across rr tracks from 100 ft swath of land. Her well is about 200 ft from railroad. Once the 27 ft of trees were removed, the noise has increased drastically. The vibration of the asphalt and rock crusher has vibrated their walls. She is extremely concerned about the integrity of their well

John Grimes - lives to the north along the railroad tracks. The noise from just moving the train cars alone will be phenomenal. With 100 ft opening, would be able to load 2 cars at a time and then would need to move the train again. He is having well issues with being able to taste minerals in the water from the past few months. Concerned if will continue to use water truck for dust control that is currently using his and Gary Glasgow's driveway. Is completely against this. This used to be a residential site and shouldn't be an industrial site.

Tracy Maxwell - For the people that are impacted the most, have they asked for QAP to change hours of operation or tree replanting afterward? Checking wells?

MPAPC Comments

Kevin D - QAP already is going beyond scope of this project and feels like they are trying to turn this into a semi permanent operation. He thinks we need to strongly oppose this for our neighbors. This should be finished at the end of this road project.

Dave P - He will be voting against. They are removing the buffers from original permit and seems unacceptable.

Dave S - Seems like QAP pulled fast one on the community. Turned community area into industrial area.

Jeff H - we don't have land use ordinances. He will vote against it, but he feels like we should let railroad and QAP to address issues. Most challenging part of this is the violations.

Jeff E - will vote against motion to approve as they have violations and haven't come to terms with local residents to address their concerns.

Bruce J - Finds it troubling that there appears that there is a paltry amount of penalty regarding violations and then allowing an extension on top of that is unacceptable. He is not opposed using gravel, but their expanded operation is far outside of what the original LUP permitted.

## 7. BOROUGH BUSINESS

### a. REPORTS

#### i. PLANNER REPORT

1. Safe Street meetings - even if can't make the meeting, they are still accepting comments on their website
2. Advisory Planning Commission structure review

Bruce attended meeting. From Bruce- Robert Roughner has been approached by some other APC in the borough. This is still advisory role, but council will not be dictated by rules of Borough. Council would not be tied to just borough business and wouldn't be held to open meetings act. The hope that this is something that it would benefit communities. Julie's recommendation is to review info in packet, come up with questions and concerns and at next meeting, have discussion and compile info for Bruce for a meeting in October.

Would Sportsmen's Club become council?

#### ii. REPORT FROM THE CHAIR

1. Communication with Board
2. Update DOT 25 to 37 - Believes that DOT has gone to bid and awarded contract to an appraiser to contact property owners. Not aware of any property owners that have been contacted.

## 8. PRESENTATIONS

- a. Tracie Maxwell Development of the Base Camp LLC along the ROW - her brother Dave and her are looking forward to being part of the community. Building a "barn-di-minium" with 2 homes together with two workshops and garages on ground

floor. Happy to show anyone around. She didn't realize the road was above and beyond; built to borough specs so they would maintain it. They feel that one of the lots from the Mental Health Trust is ideal for an organic vegetable farm. Feels that fresh vegetables are in need in our community. Eventually when retires from day job, want to have small scale farm next to highway that is currently a wetland area. Amenable to feedback from public on noise, hours, etc. Need to go through hydrology study because of being lake adjacent along with 2 small streams that flow through parcel; will either be completed by November or not until next year. Looking to get fill locally, has spoken with QAP who is interested. She doesn't know who will get bid. Will need to build access point through right of way. Plans to use rain water catchment for irrigation. Using a bunch of green technology. Considering distribution of veggies via subscription boxes. Tracy says will follow what the Army Corps of Engineers recommends.

Aaron O'Quinn - neighbor, concerned about filling pond and resulting effects of water on his property

Julie - noted another community member wrote in opposition to project

**b.** Neighborhood Watch - establishes a call list so we can acquaint yourself with our neighbors. If the community is interested, Bruce thinks get a group together to knock on doors and distribute contact info.

## **9. OLD BUSINESS**

**a.** Review of Comprehensive Plan (results of WS) Plan for fall meetings - Should schedule work session for fall and then a series of public meetings. Should include things about industrial areas and organic farms.

Please respond to emails.

**10. PUBLIC COMMENT** - Gary and Bonnie Glasgow - thank you for standing up for them.

**11. COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS** Kevin - Thanks for putting up with absences; there will be several more this winter. Wants to see group continue on. Jen - apologies for not responding to emails. Jeff E - is encouraged as it feels like Borough is listening to our comments. Dave S - discussed his road and getting up to standard. Jeff H - Question for Julie about land classification south of town, curious if there is movement on that. Dave P - read site standards that are not being followed by QAP and is sorry for people that are living with this currently. Bruce J - thanks for attending; having a full board is important. State is cutting library funding has been cut resulting in close to \$6k cut to MPPL. Individual efforts and group efforts are successful.

## **12. NEXT MEETING DATE**

**a.** October 10, 2024

**13. ADJORNMENT** Jeff H moves, Dave P 2nds. Adjourned 8:06 pm.

## **CONTACT INFORMATION**

Contact the Moose Pass Advisory Planning Commission at:

Email - visit: <https://www.kpb.us/planning-dept/planning-commissions/moose-pass-apc/email-moose-pass-apc>

On the far right-hand side of the page is a box titled, "Commissioner Information". Scroll to the bottom of the box and select, "Contact the Moose Pass APC".

Send USPS mail to:

Kenai Peninsula Borough Planning Department, Attn: Moose Pass APC,  
144 N Binkley, Soldotna, AK 99669