



Juneau Hydropower, Inc.
PO Box 22775
Juneau, AK 99802
www.juneauhydro.com
Telephone: (907) 789-2775
Fax: (907) 375-2973

April 30, 2013

For the Record

Re: Juneau Hydropower Inc. 2013 Study Plan Meeting January 31, 2013, February 1, 2013.

Background.

On November 26, 2012, Juneau Hydropower, Inc. (JHI) received the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Comments on Draft License Application for the Sweetheart Lake Hydroelectric Project. The letter discusses and comments on JHI's study plans and reports; content and format of the draft application and Preliminary Draft Environmental Assessment; and implementation of the Alternative Licensing Process. Further JHI received a, "request to file within 60 days of the date of the letter, a plan and schedule for a study plan meeting with all interested licensing participants to discuss the study plans and study reports filed to date, and any additional data needs that will need to be addressed before the next study season commences. In addition, the next steps before the preparation of your final license application should be discussed".

JHI scheduled and conducted a meeting for January 31st and February 1st, 2013, with all interested parties including resource agencies, tribes, and other interested stakeholders. The purpose of the meeting is to review studies performed; results to date; and address any additional information and study needs for the next study season. The meeting took place at Centennial Hall in Juneau and was available to participants outside the Juneau area via web presentations and telephonic participation. A copy of the agenda and supporting documents were supplied to the Stakeholders and interested parties. A document from Alaska Senator, Lisa Murkowski supporting Juneau Hydropower, Inc.'s license application and comments on the licensing process received by JHI on January 31, 2013 were also provided to stakeholders and interested parties. Specific dial in numbers and web connections were provided to stakeholders in advance of the meeting.

This meeting took place over two days and consisted of a morning and afternoon session for each day. Participants attending the meeting were asked to sign in for the meeting record.

This meeting record was produced but withheld from distribution to preclude this information and related videos from being used for competitive reasons. Now that Juneau Hydropower, Inc. has received a FERC order issuing a successive permit to Juneau Hydropower, Inc. for the Sweetheart Lake Hydroelectric Project, the following meeting summary report is being filed.

PARTICIPANTS

Participants physically attending the 2013 Study Plan Meeting

Marti Marshall, Juneau District Ranger, USFS	both days
Jennifer Berger, Lands and Special Uses Program Manager, USFS	both days
Barbara Stanley, Alaska Regional Energy Coordinator, USFS	both days
Barb Adams, USFS	both days
Duff Mitchell, Juneau Hydropower Inc.	both days
Keith Comstock, Juneau Hydropower, Inc.	both days
Jim Holeman, for Juneau Hydropower, Inc. JR Holeman Consulting	both days
Brian King, for Juneau Hydropower, Inc.	both days
Robert Johnson, for Juneau Hydropower, Inc. Civil Science Aquatics.	both days
Shawn Johnson, ADFG	both days
Roger Harding, ADFG	31st
Dan Teske, ADFG	31 st
Monte Miller, ADFG, Hydropower Permitting Coordinator	both days
John Sandor, ACE Coalition	31 st
Ted Deats, ADNR	31 st
Terry Schwarz, ADNR	31 st
Clint Gundelfinger, ADNR	31 st
Jim Anderson, ADNR	31 st
Bob Loescher, Tlingit Haida Community Council	both days
Sue Walker, NMFS	31 st , 1 st morning
Peter Bibb, IPEC	both days
Dennis Chester, USFS	1 st
Neil Barten, ADFG	1st
Ryan Scott, ADFG	1 st
Cathy Needham, for Juneau Hydropower, Inc. Kai Environmental	both days
Robina Moyer, for Juneau Hydropower, Inc. Kai Environmental	both days
Richard Carstenson, for Juneau Hydropower, Bosworth Botanical	1 st
Don Kubley, AIPPA	31st
Richard Enriquez, USFWS	both days
Myra Gilliam, USFS	1 st afternoon
Scott Willis, AEL&P	1 st
Terry Harvey, Rep. Cathy Munoz, Juneau-	31 st
Brad Fluetsch, Videographer, True North Video Productions	both days
Telephonic attendance	
Jennifer Harper, FERC	both days
John Makowski, FERC	both days
Dianne Rodman, FERC	both days
Shina Duvall, SHPO	both days

Summer Rickman, SHPO	both days
Glen Martin, AP&T	both days
Cassie Thomas, NPS	both days
Patrick Keelin, Orenco	31 st
Mark Storm, Civil Science	31 st
Koren Bosworth, Bosworth Botanical	1 st
Gary Moore, Schnabel	1 st
Mark Pipkin, Walking Dog Archeology	1 st

In addition, it appears that from the telephonic record that somebody from a Central Council of Tlingit Haida Indians telephone number called in on both days but did not identify themselves.

The Agenda for Meeting as amended:

January 31, 2013 9AM -5 PM. Hickel Room Centennial Hall, Juneau Alaska

9:00 AM Introductions

9:15 AM Project Overview & Design

10:00 AM Aquatics- Lake and Creek
Scoping, study results, go forward plan.

12:00 Light lunch served

12:30 Aquatics-Water Reservation and Hydrology Overview

1:30 PM Aquatics-Tidewater
Scoping, study results, go forward plan

3:30 PM Aquatics-Water Quality
Scoping, study results, go forward plan

4:00 PM Aquatics-Fish Collection and Transportation System Update (JHI)

February 1, 2013 9AM -5 PM. Hickel Room Centennial Hall, Juneau Alaska

9:00 AM Introductions and Study Plan discussion

9:45 AM Wildlife-Studies All components
Scoping, study results, go forward plan

11:15 AM Geology-Overview (Schnabel-Gary Rogers will call in)

12:00 Light Lunch served

1 PM Terrestrial-Botany, Wetlands-all components
Scoping, study results, go forward plan

2:30 PM Recreational and Aesthetics
Scoping, study results, go forward plan

3:45 PM Cultural Studies
Scoping, study results, go forward plan

Meeting Summary for Record

Each Agenda Item has an associated video file that is posted on the Juneau Hydropower, Inc. website. The Meeting Summary for Record is a synopsis of key points and questions as well as the go forward plan along with any agreements among the parties at the meeting. In addition below each section is a link for the video record of the section,

1-31-13 9:00 AM Introductions. Self explanatory.

1-31-13 9:15 AM Project Overview & Design

This section of the Meeting was conducted by Duff Mitchell, Business Manager for the proposed facility.

Mr. Mitchell provided an overview of the proposed project including dam and reservoir, tunnel alignment, powerhouse and tailrace, transmission line route and types, and project access road

alternatives (forest route and shoreline route). The preferred road alternative by JHI is the coastal road/trail route since it will have less impact on wetlands and require less clearing of vegetation and JHI proposes will have less environmental and scenic impact of the area.

At the present time the Forest Service does not have a route preference, but encourages an analysis of factors between the two routes.

The visual characteristics of each of the alternatives were illustrated by an artist rendering. The group however, felt that the rendering did not adequately illustrate what the views would be like from the water level.

Action: JHI agreed to produce a new rendering of the alternatives and to include a scale on the rendering allowing reviewers to determine lengths of road and location of areas of interest.

Project Overview and Design

<https://vimeo.com/60167900>

10:00 AM Aquatics- Lake and Creek -Scoping, study results, go forward plan.

Robert Johnson, CSI provided an overview of studies performed and study results for Sweetheart Lake and Sweetheart Creek.

Sweetheart Lake can be separated into three sections: an upper, middle, and lower. These sections are separated by shallow and narrow pinch points that created trout spawning habitat. Spawning habitat also occurs at the mouth of many of the inlets to the lake with inlet #1 providing the best stream spawning habitat.

Creating the Sweetheart lake reservoir by increasing the reservoir elevation would eliminate much of the current trout spawning habitat currently available. There may be some potential spawning remaining in inlet #1 but access may be blocked by barrier falls.

Some Key comments and actions. The full conversations and discussions can be obtained and reviewed at the video link listed at the end of this section.

Action: JHI to evaluate the potential spawning habitat in inlet #1 and determine if removal of barriers could provide access to additional spawning habitat.

Action: JHI to work with ADFG and USFS to develop strategies for spawning habitat enhancement/mitigation for lake elevation increase.

Several questions were raised regarding project effects on the anadromous reach of Sweetheart Creek. The following actions were recommended.

Action: JHI to include in the powerhouse design a method of bypassing flow in the event of a powerhouse outage so that flow in the tailrace and anadromous reach continues at a constant rate.

Action: JHI to identify the precise location of the tailrace discharge in relation to the upper extent of the anadromous reach of Sweetheart Creek.

Action: JHI to evaluate the essential fish habitat in the anadromous reach.

FERC Question: What are the project effects on temperature in the anadromous reach of Sweetheart Creek?

ADFG Question: What is the depth of the intake in relation to out migrating sockeye?

ADFG Question: Will the flow through the smolt barge system be sufficient?

ADFG Concern: Expressed concern regarding the maintenance of substrate in the anadromous reach.

ADFG Comment: ADFG is working on developing criteria for constructing spawning channels and will share this information when it becomes available.

ADFG Question: Will the reservoir ever spill?

NMFS Question: Is JHI planning on periodic flushing flows from the reservoir? Will there be a low level outlet in the dam capable of providing flushing flows?

NMFS Question: How will spawning gravels be maintained in the spawning channel and in the anadromous reach? Have gravel recruitment been looked at?

NMFS Question: Do you plan to install fish screen on the tunnel intake? Recommended working with agencies on designing a fish screen for the intake.

ADFG Comment: Sockeye fry may be impacted by a deep water intake if sufficient surface flows do not attract them to the capture device.

ADFG Comment: Need to determine the potential project effects on Total Dissolved Gases, there is a concern that a super saturation may occur. Tunnel size and aeration might diffuse dissolved gasses if any.

ADFG Comment: Turbine sizing and movement of fish through the turbine if brought through intake.

ACTION: Determine the impact on dissolved gasses at other hydropower projects in SE Alaska (DIPAC and Armstrong Keta use water from turbine penstocks).

ACTION: Assess the potential impacts of altered stream temperatures on spawning, rearing, and incubating fish in the anadromous reach.

NMFS Comment: Roads in intertidal zones have not worked well in other areas. The road will need to be designed to withstand the conditions.

ADFG Question: Will there be any additional instream flow study such as PHABSIM? ADFG will need to be part of the study planning process.

NMFS Comment: Studies need to address Bioenergetics (sp).

Duff Mitchell: Stressed the need to receive Agency comments of the study reports and methodology submitted to date.

Aquatics Lake and Creek video

<https://vimeo.com/60198284>

Aquatics – Water Reservation and Hydrology Overview (Patrick Keelin, Orenco Hydropower via telephone)

This section was presented and conducted by Patrick Keelin, Orenco Hydropower . In addition, Mark Storm of CSI provided additional input.

Question: Was there a correlation of flows with personal use fishing events? Does flow affect the ability of people to catch fish?

Question: What is the relationship between flows and the active storage in the reservoir?

FERC added: Need to have a reservoir operations rule curve.

Question: Since Long Lake was used as an alternate source of flow data, how well does it correlate with the data collected at Sweetheart Creek?

Question: What is the duration of the 325 cfs flow in Sweetheart Creek?

Question: Was there any analysis of the effects of climate change on snow melt and runoff?

Question: Were the effects of El Nino and La Nina years analyzed?

Question: Is there any trend looking at precipitation?

Question: Why was Long Lake used as a source of data?

Answer: Long Lake was used because of its long period of record and proximity to Sweetheart Lake and was used by USGS.

Question: How comparable are the two basins?

Similar in size

Similar in weather

Glacial effect can generate its own weather.

USGS Chose Long Lake, not JHI

Did not use rain fall used stream flow data.

Question: Sue Walker poses the opportunity to do climate monitoring and adaptive management?

Water Reservation Video

<https://vimeo.com/60198288>

1-31-13 1:30 PM Aquatics-Tidewater- Scoping, study results, go forward plan

Cathy Needham and Robina Moyer of Kai Environmental provided an overview of wildlife studies performed and study results for Sweetheart Lake and Sweetheart Creek.

Question: What was the conclusion regarding sensitivity and salinity based on modeling? Or professional judgment based that Sweetheart Creek represents 2% of the flow into Gilbert Bay?

Response: The change in the flow regime is .002%

Question: Drift chip study was made in one season and assumption is made that the currents are year round? Would different conditions change conclusions?

Question: What effect would the dock and road have on tides and currents for localized events? Would tides and currents be altered by the presence of the dock and road?

Question: What is the effect of change in the inflow during the winter? Minimal in relation to the tidal flat mixing zone.

Question: What is the effect of EMF on different species sensitivities?

Response: this issue was covered in the report.

Aquatics Tidewater video

<https://vimeo.com/60198289>

1-31-13 3:30 PM Aquatics-Water Quality Scoping, study results, go forward plan

This section was presented by JHI Duff Mitchell. It was explained that many different sections overlap the water quality area of interest and that in the future JHI would try to congregate the water quality data separately.

Question: The wording of the study is uncharacteristic for this level of study? It was pointed out that the wording is directly out of the scoping document language. Sometimes there is a missing step between data collection and conclusion.

Comment. Draft reports are issued and comments are received. Feedback is provided. The applicant can accept or reject the recommendations. FERC weighed in that this is referred to in the Communications Protocol.

It was decided that the first session of tomorrow would be to discuss the process tomorrow.

Comment. Tie the information together, to move forward. Discussion of water quality that involved other areas.

Pre and post project biotic monitoring was mentioned

Water Quality

<https://vimeo.com/60198290>

1-31-13 4:30 PM Aquatics – Fish Collection and Transportation System Updates (Duff Mitchell)

Duff Mitchell provided an overview of the JHI Fish Collection and Transportation system developed in cooperation with DIPAC hatchery. The power point provided drawings and data that was discussed at a previous working group meeting.

Question: How effective do you expect the system to be?

Response: The design is similar to other systems and takes advantage of sockeye behavior of migrating near the surface, attraction to the sound of running water, and surface water velocities. There will need to be adjustments made to make the system work efficiently and get the best result.

Sue Walker – NMFS: Offered the assistance of NMFS specialists in fish passage to review the plans and consult on the design of the system. We have 10 NOAA fish passage engineers. I can have an engineer review your system.

Question. Predation on both ends is a concern.

Question. The system as proposed might be great at moving what it catches and keeping mortality low of those that are caught. However, the big unknown, how many smolts are going to

be caught versus how many go over the falls or would have gone over the falls and now might stay behind in the lake. It is premature to determine how

Question. 16,000 pounds of fish for 4000 fish are going to be the most expensive fish in the planet. Agencies need to put the rationale and common sense into the process. Break even and a cost benefit.

FERC Comment. In the NEPA analysis FERC does a cost benefit analysis in their Comprehensive Development Section of everything that FERC recommends or does not t recommend. So cost benefit concerns will be addressed in the NEPA process. Right now we do not know what the cost estimate is.

Question and Comment. The current low survival rate of outmigrating smolts makes it easier to accomplish the goal of increasing survival with the proposed system. A low bar to overcome.

Question. There might be unintended consequences with more fish and more people with an increase in Sockeye. Point was made that the Sockeye are a small percentage in relationship to the already much larger number of Pink Salmon that inhabit the creek at the same time.

Diversity of opportunity just like we would have in any fisher.

A Plan b and have a plan c.

Actions: Continue to assemble a fish collection barge subgroup or combine with the aquatics working group chaired by Duff to review study results and propose potential resource management measures for consideration.

Fish Collection and Barge Transportation system

<https://vimeo.com/60328777>

2-1-13 9:30AM Wildlife-Studies All components Scoping, study results, go forward plan

Wildlife Studies – Kai Environmental Cathy Needham.

Cathy Needham of Kai Environmental presented the Wildlife Study components for the Sweetheart Lake Hydroelectric Project.

Question: The analysis of project effects on wildlife habitats was partially completed at the time of the draft PDEA. The Wildlife Study Report was filed after the draft license application was submitted and it was clear that not all agencies reviewed the completed Wildlife Study report. JHI filed the Draft PDEA prior to completion of the habitat and wildlife analysis due to competitive reasons.

Question From ADFG- When will the wildlife analysis be completed?

Habitat analysis is being completed and how does that impact. JHI contractor is completing the wildlife analysis under the USFS protocol. Habitat analysis is a GIS analysis to determine habitat and if habitat is being impacted.

Comment: While JHI has been designated as the non-federal representative to consult on listed species for section 7, the FERC is still responsible to consult with the Fish and Wildlife Service and NMFS.

Action: No goshawk nests were located during protocol studies within the project affected area. However, plans are for preconstruction surveys to be performed and if nests are found mitigation measures would be implemented.

Question: What would be the effects of the project on mountain goat winter populations and distribution?

ADFG questioned the results of the fly overs looking for goats.

Response: Goats were not found in the project affected area however, suitable winter habitat does exist and may be used by goats. It was recommended that an analysis of the habitat was preferred over attempting to document use of the area by goats. This approach was supported by FERC staff and the Forest Service. ADFG would prefer additional studies to document goat distribution and populations perhaps by radio collaring some goats. JHI suggested that it might consider assisting with a radio collaring study if there was shown to be a nexus to the project. Also the flights did find wildlife and were flown with ADFG personnel and we also found goats outside the area northeast of DuPont (a landmark south of Juneau) toward Juneau so the flights were valid.

Concern: There are concerns regarding the potential for bear/human incidents resulting in injuries.

Discussion: Providing hardened pathways for people would reduce the potential for surprising bears and reduce the risk. It has also been observed that the bears tend to work the south side of the stream more than the north. Perhaps the Forest Service, ADFG and JHI could work together to discourage south shore use to personal use anglers reducing the potential for bear/human conflicts. Signage was also discussed.

Action: Complete habitat analysis.

Action: Complete sensitive species analysis.

Action: Conduct ANILCA Section 810 analysis.

Action: Consult with FWS and NMFS regarding Section 7.

Comment-JHI has requested consultation with NMFS as the non-federal designee.

FERC Comment. FERC is the final consultation with the agencies.

Action: Need to look at loss of terrestrial and aquatic habitats as well as gains in aquatic habitat. Only a habitat analysis with GIS layers, in reviewing the slide but this is a wildlife presentation and its focus in from a wildlife perspective.

Comment. Do not see analysis in the forest road alternative and of habitat, but the data is not shown for the forest alternative.

Response. The forest road was completely surveyed and many resources spent but it became obvious that the coastal road was a preferred environmentally alternative. More work can be explored on the analysis from the Forest Service Guidelines per a previous working group meeting.

Question. IS JHI OK on methodologies.

ADFG Comment. A good start with last summer and talk about what is coming up. A point in time attempt with snapshots. If the goal is abundance and distribution then we will need multiple years of monitoring. Abundance is not something we need to drive to. Presence absence and perhaps some distribution.

It is a tough place for people on the ground. I hope we continue to make conversations on this. The overarching work is not done?

JHI Comment. WE are proceeding with licensing and the timeline is X , but we are looking at licensing. Pre-licensing allows us to file, but there might be conditioning. It is likely that we will not be able to study over a period of years and hold off licensing. Long term resolution with long term impacts. FERC requires things to be definable and trackable as they need to enforce it.

The question is the methodology. Your comment is that there might be too much point in time. So if more is needed, it needs to be presented to us.

FERC Comment: The wildlife studies are over, it sounds like yes. FERC is not comfortable with a monitoring program. However, if ongoing monitoring is proposed it will need to be

specific with regard to what is being monitored and what actions would be taken if specified management objectives are not achieved.

Analyze the effects and what are the licensing conditions. Monitoring population is not effective in determining project effects. Analyzing habitat is effective. The question arises where you draw the line of what and how much information is enough. There might not be goats for 3 years and then they show up or not. Gathering data that is not necessarily related to the project is an additional expense.

FERC agreed with the comments. Licensees are free to enter off licensing agreements under a good neighbor approach.

USFS Comments. Our perspective is to defend Cathy's approach to methodology. I am not worried with goats in summer. I am concerned with goats using the project area in the winter time. That is why they were looking for goats in the winter. It is tough, but that is where the data for the analysis is needed. The USFS is mostly concerned with a habitat issue. We are not going to request an abundance and distribution issue. We know that there is suitable habitat and how much habitat is going to be effected. That is basically how the USFS sees it.

ADFG Comment. We do not want to collect data for data sake. Winter surveys were a good idea and a good attempt. Any collaring should not be looked as a save all. We know that goats are there in the summer. We just don't know if they are using the area of the lake.

Does reconnaissance constitute a sufficient amount of data to make conclusions. Is there enough data to make decisions.

Jim Holemen- Cathy do you have enough information in habitat data to make a decision. Preliminarily the answer is yes.

Response- We have data for ADFG of what the areas they thought were good habitat. It is not necessarily human friendly data. We have enough resources: Lidar and USFS GIS data. WE know goats have a high site fidelity. So if we have good habitat, so we know what level of inundation so we can calculate loss of habitat but we do not know if goats are there.

Jim Holeman comment. Therefore we can calculate the acres of goat habitat impacted.

Neil Barten, ADFG. Habitat is some good points, but in good habitat there might only be 5% of habitat, but to specific goats it could be 100% of the habitat. Winter habitat is tough, but we did fly and look. Summer analysis from the ground is treacherous. There is a number of things additional could be done. Perhaps putting out motion cameras around the lakes.

The question is always going to be what is enough.

ADFG Question on lower Gilbert Bay level for deer. Study has been done by Kai in summer time.

JHI comment from Brian King. I have been out there in January and February and crawled all over the area down there and there were not deer tracks.

Richard Carstenson, JHI. Where is the preponderance of habitat? South facing?

ACTION: Complete habitat analysis.

ACTION: Complete sensitive species analysis.

ACTION: Conduct ANILCA Section 810 analysis.

ACTION: Consult with USFWS and NMFS regarding Section 7

ACTION: Report is finalized, then have working group to determine what further if anything is needed.

USFS Comment on Deer Habitat. Summer analysis is conducted for plant life and Kai Environmental did what USFS requested for habitat analysis.

JHI Comment from Brian King. Spent numerous winter days in the last two winters with multiple trips and did not see deer or deer sign except with one set of tracks and then those tracks were inconclusive.

Wildlife Video of presentation and discussion.

<https://vimeo.com/64107199>

2-1-13 11:30 AM Geology-Overview Gary Rogers, Geologist, Schnabel Associates.

Gary Rogers 30 year experience in Geology and two years on the Juneau Ice field. Lachel engineering and Schnabel and Associates. Mr. Rogers presented an overview on the geology work and testing that has occurred for the facility to include the base of the dam and the tunnel as well as to understand any geological hazards and discontinuities.

Question: soil depth in fluctuation in the inundation area?

Response: Most areas on the shore are quite steep and cliff faces have minimal soil. Forested areas are located in less steep areas have alluvial with moraine material that is coarse grained. Organics of course will be washed off.

Question: The material is indicated that it will be used in the Dam. Where will spoil materials be stored?

Response: Spoil would be stored at the location of the screening contours and possibly on the shoreline road until used as aggregate for concrete. Exhibit F identifies the berms that will be created for aesthetic purposes.

Question: Where will borrow areas be located?

Response: If additional material is needed one consideration for a borrow area is at the pier and dock location. There might be additional borrow pits around the powerhouse area.

Question: What method of tunneling is planned?

Response: It is anticipated that a tunnel boring machine would be used since the rock appears to be suitable. The tunnel boring spoil would require less processing to be used as aggregate and it would be acceptable to use for construction in the dam. However, we might use drill and shoot and that decision has not been made yet. The overall plan is to use as much material as possible for infrastructure.

Question: On water quality discussion yesterday, some questions arises on the questions of accumulation of gravels and silting.

Response: Obviously, you will have more accumulation in the upper reaches that will not wash down unless there is a spill event. Some events will occur but you will not have material continually coming down. There would be some changes in the regime. The braided nature of the stream is that the sediments are being worked. The frequency of the movement of sediments would change.

Geology video and presentation

<https://vimeo.com/64610641>

2-1-13 1 PM Terrestrial-Botany, Wetlands-all components Scoping, study results, go forward plan.

The Juneau Hydropower botanical, vegetation, rare and sensitive species and wetland delineation and assessments were conducted by Koren Bosworth and Richard Carstenson of Bosworth Botanical. The presentation for these areas of study were presented telephonically by Koren Bosworth, with Richard Carstenson in attendance at the meeting.

Comment: There is a difference between wetlands and tidelands and estuarine. These differences should be considered when evaluating the road alternatives.

Response, the way the road is designed is that it does not impact the wetlands. It is primarily located between and above high tide, but it is not impacting or going through vegetated areas. The area is a rocky terrain and is presented on the slide

Comment: There is a need for an analysis of effects of the forest road vs. the coastal road.

Response. There is a slide comparing the two and there is no estuarine wetland impact in the coastal road. The cleared area of the forest road impacts the wetlands.

Question: How will timber be removed in the inundation area of the new reservoir or will it be removed?

Response: We don't know at this point to remove the trees or let them stand. There are pros and cons for each. Leaving them stand may provide shoreline protection and wildlife habitat but may create problems for project operations. Helicopter removal of timber does not appear to be a feasible alternative.

Terrestrial Botany and Wetlands

<https://vimeo.com/64099768>

2-1-13 2:30 PM Recreational and Aesthetics Scoping, study results, go forward plan.

The Juneau Hydropower Recreation and Aesthetics study and presentation was presented by Brian King of Juneau Hydropower Inc. Brian King along with other Juneau Hydropower contractors researched and prepared the recreational and aesthetics draft study report.

Comment: Some preliminary discussions have been held with the Forest Service regarding trails, a cabin, public use of the pier, and potential to leave moorings in place for public use following construction. Since these discussions are preliminary there is a need for additional discussions regarding need, potential to induce additional public use of the area, specifications for facilities if proposed and potential effect on the environment of alternatives considered.

Comment: We are uncertain why the BLM method was used to assess visual resources. The Forest Service will require these studies be performed according to its Visual Management System.

Comment: The Forest Service needs to review the draft report on recreation and visual resources.

Comment: There may be some sensitivity about calling hunting, trapping, and fishing a recreational activity. For some these activities are sources of income and subsistence.

Comment: The PDEA needs to focus on facts.

Comment: There will be a need for a blasting plan.

Comment: There will need to be a recreation management plan.

FERC Comment: Adaptive management plans, if used, will need to contain clear and defined triggers that will cause the action to be taken. If the triggers and resulting actions are well defined, then adaptive management will be measureable and enforceable.

FERC Comment: Actions or plans need as much certainty as possible including who will own, operate, and maintain recreation facilities. These issues are not resolved.

Recreational Study Overview

<https://vimeo.com/64080136>

2-1-13 3:45 PM Cultural Studies Scoping, study results, go forward plan

Comment: Need to define the Area of Potential Effect (APE). This is the area within the project boundary plus any areas that are directly or indirectly affected by the project activities including recreation, studies that may have ground disturbance, etc.

Comment: If there are no adverse effects then there will not be a requirement for a Programmatic Agreement.

Comment: There needs to be a plan that provides for inadvertent discoveries.

Comment from FERC: Where would the proposed recreational cabin be located?

Response, due to trying to avoid bear interaction, any proposed location would be more

toward the dock than at the mouth of the creek. It was noted that the dock area was thoroughly surveyed for cultural aspects.

Comment: Native people need to have continued occupancy and use of the area and that Juneau Hydropower and their consultant was thanked for their tribal consultation to the tribe. That Douglas Indian Association was engaged and is appreciative for their input and access to Juneau Hydropower and their consultant. Juneau Hydropower is respectful and has taken into consideration the needs and interests of the Native people of the area.

Comment: Work is substantially completed, APE letter needs finalized and defined. Project Area and consultation needs to occur. Then an Assessment of Section 106 with FERC will be completed.

Comment: Inadvertent Discoveries will usually be a condition of licensing.

Comment: It is not inappropriate for the Applicant to prepare the documents and submit and the Applicant should work with the SHPO with FERC being informed but documents need to be filed as “privileged” so that historical and cultural information does not become public.

Cultural Studies

<https://vimeo.com/64119133>