

File 0907pmsweetheart.TXT cannot be converted to PDF.

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

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

September 7, 2011

6:00 p.m. - 9:00 p.m.

Juneau Centennial Hall, Hickel Room

101 Egan Drive

Juneau, AK 99801

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

ATTACHMENTS

Scoping Meeting Registration Forms

1 M E E T I N G

2 MR. MITCHELL:the presentation with the
3 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and Juneau
4 Hydropower. This is on the Sweetheart Lake
5 hydroelectric project, which is in the City and
6 Borough of Juneau, it's on the Tongass Forest --
7 National Forest. We have an agenda tonight that we
8 were using earlier. However, I would like to modify
9 that. I know there are some people that have
10 indicated that they need to leave early. This is the
11 alternative licensing process, which is very
12 collaborative and wants to get comments from the
13 public and have everyone have their two cents, so to
14 say.

15 So, what I would like to do is modify our
16 agenda. And if there's any people that need to leave
17 or feel they're going to need to leave before we get
18 to the comments near the end, I'd be more than
19 willing, if you had prepared comments or whatever, if
20 you'd like to state them and then you can go. I'd
21 also like to acknowledge Representative Minoz, Cathy
22 Minoz, representing Juneau in our midst.

23 MS. MINOZ: Thank you.

24 MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Cathy. With that,
25 I'll do the introductions and then we can open if
26 there's some comments. I'm Duff Mitchell with Juneau
27 Hydropower, Inc. I'm the business manager of this

1 hydroelectric project. We filed for the project
2 December of 2009 for our preliminary permit. This is
3 our scoping document, we've been working fastidiously
4 from when we filed our permit to now. This kind of
5 gives you the run over of where we're -- the road map
6 of where we're going to study and the issues that
7 we're going to cover to file our licensing documents
8 in and or around November, December of 2012. Again,
9 I'm Duff Mitchell, business manager. This is Keith
10 Comstock, president and CEO of Juneau Hydropower.
11 Keith does snow bird at times, but he lives in
12 Juneau. And would you like to say a few words,
13 Keith?

14 MR. COMSTOCK: Well, just sorry I missed those
15 in the morning meeting. We were down on the project
16 and the weather yesterday was not really conducive
17 for boating. So, we got to look at a lot of bears
18 last night. That was a lot of fun. And happy to be
19 here and glad to be participating.

20 MR. MITCHELL: Thanks. I also want to introduce
21 Merrill Sanford on our City and Borough Assembly.
22 Another elected official that's involved with
23 regional issues, as well as City and Borough of
24 Juneau. And Randy Wanamaker, who is a former
25 assembly member and is running unopposed, so he might
26 as well be the incoming assembly member in the City
27 and Borough of Juneau. We also have Cathy Needham,

1 one of our contractors with Kai Environmental, she'll
2 be doing our wildlife studies. And there's a couple
3 guys floating around here that are some of our fish
4 techs and go get coffee guys. And they're younger
5 and they do all the hard lifting for Juneau
6 Hydropower, Cameron Mitchell and Nathan Schroeder.
7 And with that, I'll turn it over to FERC
8 introductions.

9 MS. HARPER: Okay. Hi, I'm Jennifer Harper, I
10 work for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission in
11 Washington, D.C. And before my colleagues introduce
12 themselves, I wanted to take the opportunity to thank
13 you all so much for coming out tonight. Scoping's a
14 very important component of the licensing process.
15 And so, thank you all for taking time out of your
16 very busy schedules to come and share your thoughts
17 and learn some more information about the licensing
18 process that the project that's being proposed.

19 Also, I wanted to just point out a couple of
20 administrative things real quick. If you notice, we
21 have a court reporter with us. So, all of the
22 comments that are being made tonight, there's going
23 to be an official transcript made. So, when you do
24 get up to speak or to ask a question, if you could,
25 number one, make sure you state your name. And
26 number two, try to project and be nice and loud and
27 clear so we can make sure that we get a good

1 recording for our transcript. It's very important to
2 us to have a complete record. And your help with
3 that is very much appreciated.

4 In addition to doing the coordinating for the
5 project on the FERC end, I'm also the engineer on the
6 project. So, I'll be doing a lot of the engineering
7 analysis on the licensing side. So, with that, I'll
8 let my colleagues introduce themselves.

9 MR. SMITH: My name's Ian Smith, I'm a fisheries
10 biologist for the northwest region of Federal Energy
11 Regulatory Commission.

12 MS. RODMAN: Dianne Rodman, I'm a terrestrial
13 biologist with FERC, working with the team on botany
14 and wildlife issues. And like the -- my colleagues,
15 I'm also from the Washington, D.C. office.

16 MR. BROOKS: And I'm Keith Brooks, I'm with the
17 Office of the General Counsel at FERC and I'm the
18 attorney on this project. And again, I'd like to
19 repeat what Jen said, thanking everyone for coming
20 tonight and participating in this scoping meeting.

21 MR. MITCHELL: Did you want to cover the
22 alternative lice -- or maybe comments? Yeah.

23 MS. HARPER: Yeah.

24 MR. MITCHELL: At this time, I'd like to open it
25 up for comments for anybody that can't -- this
26 meeting is scheduled to go to 9:00 o'clock. I doubt
27 if it will go that long, but I never -- the meeting

1 this morning, I thought was only going to go three
2 hours, and worked through lunch -- part of lunchtime.
3 So, with that, I know there's people with busy
4 schedules and whatnot, if anyone would like to make
5 comments regarding the project, I would like to
6 invite them to do so at this time. Go ahead, Randy.
7 If you'd come up to the microphone and -- do you need
8 them to state their name?

9 THE REPORTER: Yes, please.

10 MR. WANAMAKER: Here? Or.....

11 MR. MITCHELL: You can sit right there or stand.
12 Yeah.

13 MR. WANAMAKER: Thank you. My name is Randy
14 Wanamaker, I live here in Juneau, Alaska, long term
15 resident and registered environmental assessor and a
16 certified professional geologist. I'm speaking for
17 myself tonight, not representing anyone other than my
18 personal point of view. But as a long term Southeast
19 Alaska resident and someone who's been involved with
20 other hydro projects in Southeast Alaska and in
21 Washington state, I've worked for a long time on a
22 number of economic development issues. And without
23 affordable energy, there is no economy. And without
24 an economy, there are no jobs. I know this still
25 needs to go through some studies before you can make
26 a decision. But affordable energy is something this
27 community needs.

1 I just finished a few months ago serving nine
2 years on the City and Borough Assembly, and three of
3 those years as deputy mayor. This community needs
4 affordable energy in order to grow and in order to
5 sustain our economy and provide new jobs for our
6 young people. It's essential. Southeast Alaska has
7 hydro potential. And if this is demonstrated to be
8 an environmentally responsible project, I urge you to
9 permit it with all due speed, because this community
10 and this region need affordable energy. And hydro
11 energy is good, clean energy. I thank you.

12 MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Randy.

13 MS. MINOZ: My name is Cathy Minoz, I represent
14 District Four here in Juneau, the Mendenhall Valley,
15 primarily. I've served in the Alaska Legislature for
16 three years, I'm in my second term. And I've been
17 very impressed with Juneau Hydropower and the way
18 that they have approached this project. I've been
19 particularly impressed with Duff Mitchell's outreach
20 to the community, to the legislature, to the city and
21 other effective entities within our community. I
22 will say that the Alaska Legislature in 2008 passed
23 legislation establishing policy -- energy policy for
24 the State of Alaska, which aggressively seeks to
25 achieve 50 percent of our electric generation through
26 renewables by 2025.

27 We have a ways to go, but I see projects like

1 Juneau Hydropower's sweet lake -- Sweetheart Lake
2 project as part of the solution. We're particularly
3 blessed in Southeast Alaska with hydro resources,
4 geothermal, wind and tidal, but particularly hydro
5 and the great potential that we have in this region
6 to further develop those resources. Here in Juneau,
7 we -- while we have great resources -- hydro
8 resources, still much of our power generation is
9 generated through diesel power, our electric
10 generation. And I do feel strongly that projects
11 like the proposal you have before you will continue
12 to help meet the demand that we will have as a
13 growing community for alternative energy. And with
14 that, I thank you for your presentation, for your
15 willingness to come to Juneau. That's a long way to
16 travel, and I hope your stay here is very enjoyable.
17 Thank you.

18 MS. HARPER: Thank you.

19 MR. MITCHELL: Thank you Representative Minoz.

20 MS. MINOZ: Thank you.

21 MR. MITCHELL: Would anybody else like to make
22 some comments. Brad Fluetsch, our videographer has
23 stepped off the camera and he's also a candidate for
24 the City and Borough Assembly.

25 MR. FLUETSCH: My name is Brad Fluetsch, 5730
26 North Douglas Highway. One of the privileges I have
27 as a videographer is videotaping a number of people.

1 And recently as last Thursday, Tim McLeod, president
2 of AEL&P, Juneau's monopoly electrical company
3 declared Juneau out of power. We do not have enough
4 power to support Greens Creek Mine. We do not have
5 enough power to support the cruise ships. We do not
6 have enough power to open the AJ Mine. We do not
7 have enough electricity to offset becoming a
8 conversion from diesel heating to electricity.

9 As gasoline reaches \$7 and \$8 a gallon in Juneau
10 in the next 24 months, because of your counterpart
11 Ben Bernanke's printed money, we are going to have to
12 have electricity and there is going to be a mass
13 conversion from diesel heating and gasoline
14 transportation to electricity. We need power and we
15 need it now. We don't need it yesterday. We have to
16 start construction immediately to meet this coming
17 demand. And I urge FERC to accelerate this process
18 to meet the coming energy demands of, not just
19 Juneau, but all of Southeast. And put every
20 electrical project -- elect -- hydroelectric project
21 on a fast track. It creates jobs, it creates
22 opportunity, it better utilizes Alaska's natural
23 clean energy resources. Thank you for this time.

24 MR. MITCHELL: Would anyone else like to make
25 any comments? Peter?

26 MR. NAOROZ: My name is Peter Naoroz, I'm at
27 4660 Thane Road. I probably, looking around the

1 room, I'm the person who lives closest to the
2 project, a few miles south of where we're sitting
3 right now. I'm also the general manager and
4 president of Kootznoowoo, Inc., the Native
5 corporation for Angoon, which is the closest
6 community, other than Juneau, to the project site.
7 And I -- let me start off first by saying that Angoon
8 adopted a resolution 08.01 that I can provide the
9 applicant and the FERC that basically supports this
10 project and projects like this in the region.

11 And we were called by the FERC on the Takatz
12 application, which is pending, and I think is being
13 renewed right now. But we weren't called on this
14 one, though. We have probably as many cultural ties
15 to this location as to Takatz. And while this is not
16 a tribal consultation, I understand. My Board has,
17 like I said in 08.01, supported this project and some
18 of the concepts that were mentioned earlier. A
19 comment in terms of the project map overview, I know
20 this is a FERC requirement to size and such. But you
21 know, this project is really more than just Juneau my
22 mind.

23 One of the problems and deficiencies we see with
24 TLMP, which is the Tongass Land Management Plan, is
25 the lack of transmission lines and corridors to serve
26 the region. And I know the applicant hasn't put this
27 as anything more than what they have in the

1 application, but we think that in order for our
2 region and for our country to be secure, then we have
3 to have an abundant energy supply domestically. And
4 this is one of those types of projects. So, speaking
5 for a little over 1,200 shareholders, the majority of
6 which live in Juneau, in the City and Borough of
7 Juneau, I -- you know, we come in support of this
8 project.

9 We know there's a lot of questions. I
10 personally have -- in addition to living close to
11 this project, I personally have -- I think the term
12 is -- it's not subsi -- personal use fishing in that
13 area, gone for sockeye. And it's a wonderful, you
14 know, past time. It's -- and it's nice to catch fish
15 when you're down there. But I would say that it's a
16 very different from the subsistence fisheries around
17 Angoon that our people rely on. This is more of a
18 state stock project and it's not a project -- or a
19 population of salmon. And while it's nice, it's not
20 something that a community has depended on for 10,000
21 years. So, there's a quantitative -- qualitative
22 difference in terms of that fishery.

23 We have recently gone through a similar project
24 -- process with the state -- the Forest Service with
25 regard to a small river project. A footnote is
26 Thayer Creek on Admiralty Island. Thayer was
27 exempted from FERC because it's in a National

1 Monument wilderness, and it's also under five
2 megawatts. But the problems that we had in terms of
3 dealing with fishery biologists and such,
4 traditionally, that -- and I'm not trying to confuse
5 things here, but that traditionally, that stream was
6 called Poison Creek because it wasn't an important
7 stream in terms of a comparative basis. So, our
8 elders and our forefathers made the decision that
9 that's the one they wanted to approach Congress
10 about.

11 And I would look, in terms of all the fishery
12 areas around Juneau, and I would say this is not an
13 important fishery area for Juneau, either
14 historically or commercially, honestly. And from my
15 personal perspective, it's a personal use fishery.
16 And I've -- and from what I understand of the project
17 in talking to the project proponent, this is a system
18 that can be enhanced in that regard. And it's not
19 something that I would worry terribly about from a
20 scoping perspective.

21 What I do think from a scoping perspective is
22 important is what are the alternatives to building a
23 Sweetheart? Is it burning more diesel? And I think
24 -- knowing a little bit about the way the NEPA
25 process works, I don't think enough is really put in
26 terms of the case for not doing anything. The no-
27 option case. I mean, so I think -- our problems, and

1 some of the people have articulated better than I'm
2 able to is that we are dependent on diesel in this
3 community. We are simply out of hydroelectric power.
4 And we shouldn't be just at a tipping point, we
5 should be way over that so that the region can grow,
6 in my opinion.

7 So, this is probably a comment to FERC as much
8 as anything else, I think the traditional way of
9 looking at projects in terms of looking at project
10 area and, kind of -- particularly in an area like
11 Southeast where you don't -- where you're not
12 integrated with a larger market. You know, is --
13 there's something that needs to be changed. I think
14 you need to look at your -- I think you need to look
15 at -- and perhaps, this isn't under cumulative
16 impacts, but you need to look at what happens if you
17 don't do this to these communities. These standalone
18 communities that don't have more than enough power.
19 How are they going to survive into the future?

20 And so for that reason, our corporation made a
21 strategic decision that we want to support projects
22 like this throughout the region and with our
23 neighbors in British Columbia. We think it's really
24 one of the few ways that we can dig out of the
25 current situation we're in, in terms of economic
26 future. So, it's good for Juneau, it's good for the
27 region, it's -- and primarily through its ability to

1 clean -- create clean energy and clean jobs. Thank
2 you for the opportunity to speak.

3 MS. HARPER: Oh, thank you.

4 MR. MITCHELL: Thank you to you. Is there any
5 other folks that would like to comment prior to us
6 jumping into this scoping document? There will be
7 another perio -- portion at the end for also
8 additional comments if people would like to -- if
9 they're going to be here for the rest of the meeting.
10 But with that, I will drive in with the scoping.
11 We've covered the agenda. What we're going to do is
12 we're -- well, let me cover it real quick.

13 We're going to -- after the introductions, I'm
14 going to go through the project description overview.
15 I'm sorry -- FERC is going to jump into the
16 alternative licensing process, to kind of explain to
17 everybody the FERC alternative licensing process,
18 which Juneau Hydro's subscribing to. And then we'll
19 go into the project description, some of the proposed
20 measures and the proposed action alternatives. Then
21 FERC will cover the scope of cumulative effects and
22 site specific resource issues. And then we will go
23 into the potential studies with time permitting. And
24 then we'll open up for audience comments and
25 questions and then closing comments. So, with that,
26 Jen, I'll turn it over to you for the alternative
27 licensing process.

1 MS. HARPER: Okay. Thank you. As Mr. Mitchell
2 said, Juneau Hydro has elected to pursue, with the
3 support of many of the agencies, something that we
4 call the alternative licensing process. And the
5 alternative licensing process was designed to allow
6 the project applicant, the stakeholders, and the
7 agencies a very collaborative approach to identifying
8 issues, getting the information that's needed,
9 getting study requests, and trying to work together
10 so that as the applicant's developing their license
11 application, all of the informational needs are taken
12 care of up front.

13 Now, in -- within the FERC process, we are
14 currently in what's known as pre-filing. So, right
15 now we have a notice of intent and a pre-application
16 document that we've received from Juneau Hydropower
17 saying that they are going to prepare a license
18 application. And so, where we are right now is
19 that's been filed, this is the next stage, which we
20 refer to as scoping, where we come to the community,
21 we come to the agencies and we say, well we've looked
22 at the application. Mr. Mitchell's looked at the
23 issues. And we've identified issues that we think
24 are important that are going to need to be looked at
25 to satisfy our regulations.

26 But your role here tonight is to go through
27 these issues with us and help us decide, did we get

1 everything? Did we miss something? Is there
2 something important to you, within the community,
3 that has not been identified that needs to be looked
4 at before that license application is filed. Right
5 now, while we're in the pre-filing process, there's a
6 lot of free flow of information. Once the license
7 application is filed, then things become a lot more
8 formalized, and correspondence needs to be put on the
9 record in e-library.

10 So, you know, that's just a -- right now while
11 we're in pre-filing, we're all just chatting and
12 trying to make sure that we've got everything and all
13 of the stakeholders identified. And again, this
14 helps with the review process, not just for us, but
15 also for the agencies to make sure that before that
16 license application is filed. With the ALP, what we
17 want to happen is that we have enough information
18 here at FERC that we can then proceed directly with
19 our own Environmental Assessment and then make our
20 decision as to whether or not a license will be
21 granted. And if so, what conditions will be put on
22 that license.

23 We want to make sure that all study requests
24 that are needed for that decision to be made are
25 brought forward here during the pre-filing, because
26 it slows things down considerably if, after the
27 license application is filed, someone comes forward

1 with a study request. So, again, your role here
2 tonight is very important, not just for us, but also
3 for Mr. Mitchell's process to make sure that we get
4 all of the information that we need. Let's see,
5 that's been covered.

6 MR. RODMAN: Do we have extra copies of the
7 scoping document?

8 MS. HARPER: We do have a couple. For those of
9 you who do not have a copy of the scoping document,
10 we have a few extra copies here. Is there anyone who
11 would like a copy? Okay. Anyone else need a copy of
12 the scoping document? Within the scoping document
13 itself, we have -- let me find the page that it's
14 listed on. The -- where to file. Okay. Page 36 of
15 the scoping document.

16 Now, again, we're taking comments on the record
17 tonight. We're answering questions. We're trying to
18 make sure that you understand the process. But let's
19 say that you go home and then tomorrow you go, oh, I
20 have a comment. Within the scoping document on page
21 36, there are directions for how to file comments
22 with FERC and also with Mr. Mitchell. And our
23 website's very easy, www.ferc.gov. And we have a 1-
24 800 number if you get in there and you're trying to
25 file comments and you run into a technical problem.
26 We have a help line that can help you walk through
27 that process.

1 We also, at FERC, have something that we call e-
2 subscription. And it's -- same place, it's on the
3 website, and what you can do is you can register.
4 This is project number 13563, and that number is on
5 the scoping document. If you e-subscribe, you can
6 then receive in your e-mail inbox, all official on
7 the record correspondence having to do with this
8 project. So, if you are interested and want to keep
9 up with what's going on, who's filing comments, what
10 people are saying, any documents we send to Mr.
11 Mitchell. That's the easiest and best way to do it.
12 You can also request to be put on our mail list. And
13 you can also -- Mr. Mitchell has a mail list, as
14 well. You can request to be put on his mail list.

15 So, in terms of getting information from us,
16 that's probably the best way to go. We also have
17 something called e-library, and this is where all of
18 our official documents are stored. If you go to e-
19 library on our website and type in this project
20 number, you will see everything that's official on
21 the record with FERC back to when Mr. Mitchell filed
22 his first preliminary permit application. So, every
23 letter, every on the record comment, all of these
24 documents you see here, the scoping document and also
25 his pre-application document are in e-library. Yes?

26 MS. RODMAN: Jen mentioned the project number
27 13563.

1 MS. HARPER: Yes.

2 MS. RODMAN: If you're working with our website,
3 it will ask for a docket number. And what it wants
4 out of you is P, either uppercase or lower case,
5 doesn't matter, hyphen, and then that number. So,
6 the P will say, oh, this is a hydro project. And it
7 will either take -- go to the hydro files rather than
8 the electric rates and the natural gas or anything
9 like that. So -- but if you have a problem with it,
10 remember the P-13563, it wants that. And if not,
11 check with the help desk.

12 MS. HARPER: We're actually pretty fortunate
13 because his project is in the 1,300s, or the 13,000s.
14 It's a bigger problem with projects that are, say, P-
15 208, where we do have dockets in other subgroups.
16 But I think in -- I think with us right now, you're
17 the -- I don't think we have another docket with your
18 number in gas or rates or anything like that.

19 MS. RODMAN: Okay. All right.

20 MS. HARPER: So, if you put the P, great, it'll
21 tell our system that you're looking at hydro. But I
22 think for this one.....

23 MS. RODMAN: I think you can do it.

24 MS. HARPER: Yeah. Yeah. So, there is that.
25 But again, our help desk, we have people that this is
26 all they do is help the public get documents, get
27 information from us, and help people get information

1 to us. So, again, if you think of something later
2 and you want to file comments, we welcome your
3 comments at any time. We ask for comments on the
4 scoping document to be done within 30 days. But
5 again, if it's 31 days and you have a comment, please
6 file it with us. Just because it's after the 30 day
7 request time, we still are very anxious to hear from
8 you.

9 So, as I mentioned, we are here at scoping. So,
10 this is your opportunity to tell us what you think,
11 what we need to look at and any information that we
12 need to know to help us make our licensing decision.
13 So, you are a very important component of this
14 process. So, again, comments can be made orally.
15 You can -- if you've got them written down, you can
16 hand them to our court reporter and he will attach
17 them to the transcript. You can mail them into the
18 Commission, and within that scoping document is the
19 actual mail address you can use. Or you can go
20 online to our e-filing and file them there. Or if
21 they're short comments, you can also use the quick
22 comment, which people tell us is even easier to use
23 than e-filing. So, with that, I think we can --
24 unless you guys have anything to add to the ALP
25 process? Okay. Fantastic.

26 MR. MITCHELL: All right. Thank you, Ms.
27 Harper. I would just add that even though our

1 website isn't official like FERC, the ef --
2 www.ferc.gov, on our website www.juneauhydro.com, we
3 try to have all the mirrored documents that we file
4 with FERC if you go to our FERC documents. But in
5 addition, you'll find additional information on our
6 project. In addition, we film all of our public
7 meetings, which is unique in most instances. You
8 won't find that in most hydropower projects. And so,
9 this is being filmed, our previous agency meetings
10 have been filmed. And so, you can go back many
11 months after the meeting happened and say, what did
12 they say? What was that context? And you will be
13 able to find it. That sometimes that is a good thing
14 and not so good thing. But it is what it is, and we
15 have it there for the openness, and we believe very
16 strongly in that collaborative part of it. And so,
17 you can do that at your leisure.

18 Diving into where we're headed here, for those
19 that -- of you that aren't familiar where the
20 Sweetheart project site is located, it's actually
21 located south of Juneau, about 35 miles and 30 miles,
22 depending on whether you take a boat or by plane.
23 It's -- if you go up Port Snettisham and then hang
24 south into Gilbert Bay, that is where Sweetheart
25 Creek is. Here's another map. If you've gone to
26 Tracy Arm, you've gone too far. We're the turn down
27 one canal before you hit there, Stephen's Passage.

1 The -- all of our -- this is the boundary of our
2 project, and I'll stand up for a second. What we've
3 done is -- the reason why it's oblong like this, or
4 just not a straight square is that we've gone from
5 ridge line to ridge line to project boundary the
6 entire watershed. Even though Upper Sweetheart Lake
7 is in the watershed, we're not going to have any
8 impacts or any activities on Upper Sweetheart Lake.
9 So, this is the watershed of Lower and Upper
10 Sweetheart Lake. And of course, Upper Sweetheart
11 Lake's watershed flows into Lower Sweetheart Lake.
12 This is the creek area, and this is where we propose
13 to do a conduit tunnel.

14 We'll have a powerhouse in and around here,
15 right below the barrier falls, where we will
16 redeposit the water in below the barrier falls.
17 We'll have a very short road behind the tree line
18 from the beach and then we will have a dock. From
19 the dock, we will either -- and there's two
20 alternatives for transmission line. It will either
21 go overland with a short submarine cable across
22 Gilbert Bay, go down the peninsula and then cut
23 across Port Snettisham and connect in the current
24 Snettisham line. So, it'll connect into the
25 Snettisham line.

26 For those of you that are concerned, the
27 avalanche area for Snettisham is up in here. So, we

1 would be connecting in after the avalanche area.
2 Now, if we don't go the overland route, we would take
3 a submarine route and basically connect at the same
4 point.

5 Here's a satellite photo of the project. Upper
6 Sweetheart Lake is actually right up here. And this
7 is the Tracy Arms area, as you can see the ridge
8 line. And then that's the Tracy Arms area, and this
9 is Gilbert Bay, and this is the Whiting River.

10 A little bit on the project background. This
11 project has been thought about for going on a
12 century. In 1915, the U.S. Geological Service
13 instituted stream gauging along Sweetheart Creek and
14 ran a gauging station from 1915 to 1927. There's
15 been additional records where they have correlated
16 the stream gauging records by using local estimated
17 monthly runoffs through 1928 through 1932. And then
18 also from 1949 to 1956. The project site was
19 selected in 1929 by the U.S. government as a federal
20 power site classification by Department of Interior.
21 Now, this is in effect today, this power site
22 classification is in effect today and it was issued
23 under Public Land Order 221 of May 14th, 1929.

24 In 1952, the Secretary of Interior, in his
25 report to Congress stated that Sweetheart Lake in
26 Southeast Alaska is an important source of water for
27 potential production of hydroelectric energy. In

1 1958 the United States Geological Service conducted -
2 - or devised a plan and dam site to build Sweetheart
3 Lake -- the Lower Sweetheart Lake. And the Alaska
4 Power Administration did a reconnaissance plan in
5 1983. All the studies in our current plan is is that
6 the project will generate 30 megawatts, generating
7 136 gigawatt hours annually. And traditionally,
8 based on the historical records, the rainfall is over
9 115 inches annually.

10 Now, I'm going to go into project description
11 and features. This is the 1958 USGS plan for the dam
12 site. The reservoir, the project would impound Lower
13 Sweetheart Lake, which currently is at an elevation
14 of 544 feet and we would increase the elevation of
15 the lake to 629 feet and increase the surface area
16 from 1,414 acres to approximately 1,635. The result
17 is that we would increase the storage to
18 approximately 129,693 acre feet. Now, the proposed
19 project operation would fluctuate the surface of the
20 lake by 60 feet annually. And I want to make it
21 clear, because I want to make sure I'm not -- we're
22 going to actually raise the lake to a potential of 85
23 feet from four -- 544 to 629 feet. But then we would
24 fluctuate it annually from that 629, down for 60
25 feet.

26 This is a picture of the dam area, that's a
27 picture of the outlet. The top picture is where the

1 USGS showed where they would be putting the dam. And
2 then there -- the picture below is approximately
3 where the dam would go. It would be about 500 feet
4 long and about 90 feet high. The trees in the
5 picture are about in the 75 feet, 60 feet area. So,
6 the rectangle is about the height of the dam, give or
7 take. But the distance would be longer.

8 We would be using a lake tap syphon intake. We
9 wouldn't be necessarily drilling a hole in the bottom
10 of the lake like a bathtub, but it would pierce the
11 side of the lake. And this would be about -- and
12 we're estimating -- and it would be depending on
13 engineering, but about 60 feet below the current
14 surface. And we would tap into the lake, either
15 through the lake tap or through a syphon system,
16 which is similar, but it would be drawing water up
17 and then down. And then we would be putting it down
18 through a tunnel -- an unlined tunnel, and then we
19 would have a lined tunnel at the end going to the
20 powerhouse.

21 And that powerhouse would be right and/or near
22 the barrier falls, where we would have a tailrace
23 reenter the water into right below the barrier falls.
24 And then we would have a transmission line off of a
25 dock where the powerhouse would have a transmission
26 line, go down to the road to the dock, and then off.

27 The powerhouse, this is a picture of the

1 Snettisham portal at the Snettisham in ground
2 powerhouse. This is the concept we want to employ.
3 If the geology will allow, we want to actually put
4 the powerhouse into the mountainside out there. And
5 there's several reasons for this, one, it will
6 minimize the aesthetic disturbance, it will minimize
7 the sound disturbance, and also it will help blend
8 the project in with its natural surroundings.

9 Powerhouse will contain two generating units
10 with a total capacity -- installed capacity of 30
11 megawatts. We would have a tailrace discharging into
12 the lake. This is the barrier falls of Sweetheart.
13 So, we propose to have a tailrace that would be
14 coming in like this and reentering at the base of the
15 barrier falls. And the powerhouse would be up in
16 this location. And these are general.

17 The road and dock, here's a satellite photo of
18 the area where the road and dock would go. We would
19 have about a six -- .6 -- little over a half-mile
20 long road to the powerhou -- from the powerhouse to
21 the dock. And we'd be located on the eastern shore
22 of Gilbert Bay. So, somewhere in this area.

23 These are the proposed transmission routes.
24 Like I was explaining earlier, one is an all
25 submarine cable route. And one is a submarine and
26 then overland route. Gilbert Bay is used for
27 commercial shrimping and commercial crabbing. So,

1 submarine cable could impact fishers. And so, we've
2 left both of these alternatives open for discussion.
3 We are doing a wetlands delineation for the overland
4 route in case that route is selected.

5 The transmission line would be 138 kilovolt
6 transmission line. It had a little bit differences
7 in the distance, depending on which way we go,
8 whether it's a complete submerged line or an overland
9 and submerged line.

10 And then this is a picture of the Port Snettish
11 -- of the Snettisham power line where we would
12 intersect. If we're on this side of Port Snettisham
13 on the southern side, this is on the northern side,
14 the submarine cable, whether we do an overland and
15 submarine cable or we do 100 percent submarine cable,
16 it would -- we would be intersecting somewhere in
17 here with the Snettisham power line. The Snettisham
18 power line continues to go up through and up into
19 Port Snettisham, and the avalanche area is much
20 further down. So, we would be -- like I said
21 earlier, we would be connecting after the avalanche
22 areas.

23 Proposed operations, the project would
24 supplement energy generated by Alaska Electric Light
25 and Power's hydroelectric and diesel generation
26 facilities here in Juneau, and possibly serve
27 electrical needs beyond the AEL&P service district.

1 The Sweetheart Lake Hydroelectric Project could be
2 used to meet CBJ, City and Borough of Juneau, base
3 load or peaking load, depending on reservoir
4 management and frequency control. Generation could
5 be optimized by following a rule curve reflecting
6 seasonal inflow, spill capacities and drawdown
7 limitations. And the final project and system load
8 configuration would be determined in further
9 feasibility studies.

10 Like we've stated before, the proposed project
11 would have an installed capacity of 30 megawatts and
12 136 gigawatt hours. Just to correlate with you,
13 Snettisham is about 70 megawatts. I'm not sure what
14 the gigawatt hours it puts out. Lake Dorothy is 14.3
15 megawatts, and I think they put out about 75
16 gigawatts. So, this would be a little bit larger in
17 the gigawatts, and almost double in the megawatt
18 installed capacity.

19 We would install the powerhouse so that it could
20 operate automatically. But we plan on having a fire
21 watch or someone there on the premises all the time
22 so that it could be operated manually.

23 These are the proposed environmental measures.
24 Now, we're going to go through the proposed
25 environmental measures, and then we can go into
26 studies later and we can cover some things. Now,
27 this morning, some things were modified, and we can

1 get into that. We've had some changes a little bit
2 from agencies, but I'm going to go through with what
3 we had earlier. And the changes are subtle and
4 small, but there's a few.

5 Geological and soil resources, we're develop and
6 implement an erosion and sediment control plan to
7 ensure that any activities that we do don't end up
8 with mud and undue erosion and sediment into the
9 creek. We'll have a plan to try to mitigate that.

10 Underneath aquatic resources, we're going to
11 develop and implement downstream fish passage for
12 salmon smolts. Currently the lake is stocked by
13 Douglas Island Pink and Chum's sockeye out of the
14 Snettisham hatchery. The put approximately half a
15 million fry in there every year. And then they
16 become smolts and they leave the lake, they tumble
17 over the falls. They feel that there's about a 50 to
18 60 percent mortality. And so, what we are going to
19 do is implement a downstream fish passage for those
20 salmon. There is two downstream fish passages like
21 this in the State of Alaska. There's one at Deer
22 Lake on Baranoff Island and there's one at Sprit Lake
23 in Kodiak. Deer Lake is for coho and Spirit Lake is
24 for sockeye. So, we would be integrating those
25 design features into -- and adapting them, tailoring
26 them, to the Lower Sweetheart Lake.

27 We'd design the tailrace to potentially expand

1 salmon spawning habitat at Sweetheart Creek. As
2 hydropower, you can develop a tailrace. And a
3 tailrace is your exit water coming from your
4 turbines. Now, that exit water, that tailrace, can
5 be in a concrete shoot like you see out at DIPAC or
6 Gold Creek. Or it's like what we propose, we're
7 going to try to have it in a natural setting,
8 actually putting boulders out there and making it a
9 natural tailrace so that it actually -- with the
10 intention of increasing the salmon spawning habitat.

11 We would develop and implement a Water
12 Management Plan, including scheduled instream flow
13 releases to Sweetheart Creek. Like I've discussed
14 with my friend Shawn back here, it doesn't do you any
15 good to make a pretty tailrace if you de-water it at
16 the wrong time of the year and it causes problems
17 with the salmon. So, if we increase that salmon
18 habitat, there's actually going to have to be
19 regiments of flow consistency to allow for the life
20 cycles of the salmon that would be using that
21 expanded spawning habitat. Develop and implement a
22 spill prevention, control, and containment plan.

23 For terrestrial resources, we'd propose and
24 develop and implement a terrestrial connectivity plan
25 for wildlife habitat. What that is is you have
26 different areas where habitat cross over. And if you
27 have a big pipe that blocks bear or goats or

1 something from crossing from one habitat to another,
2 that causes a problem. We're proposing to bury this
3 to try to mitigate some of that connectivity. But we
4 will get into the detailed studies of where and how
5 we might have problems or how that will work. And
6 that's what we have Cathy for.

7 Develop and implement a vegetation management
8 plan that would also include monitoring of invasive
9 plants. We would try to preserve as much vegetation
10 as possible and, as necessary, to re-vegetate --
11 re-vegetate disturbed areas using a native seed. We
12 would construct a powerhouse in-ground to minimize
13 wildlife habitat impacts, and to the extent that it
14 is engineering feasible. And adopt goshawk, raptor
15 nesting protocols around all goshawk, raptor nests to
16 minimize disturbance of nesting pairs and their
17 young.

18 One other thing I want to point out is that, in
19 addition to building our powerhouse inside the
20 hillside, so to say, we're also proposing to do is
21 take some of that waste rock and create a mound that
22 would completely encircle, except for where the road
23 and the transmission lines goes, so that it would
24 minimize the scenic prob -- well, not scenic
25 problems, but the scenic disturbance, and also help
26 muffle any sound into this very unique piece of
27 Southeast Alaska. So, we would -- and then that

1 would be re-vegetated and re-seeded with natural seed
2 so it would grow. So, you'd actually, from the
3 creek, at some point in the future, it is our
4 intention that you won't even be able to see the
5 powerhouse.

6 Threatened and endangered species, there's no
7 PM&E measures -- I'm trying to get the PM&E -- Ms.
8 Harper, can you help me out? I'm -- I got a
9 mind.....

10 MS. RODMAN: Protection Mitigation and
11 Enhancement.

12 MR. MITCHELL: There you go. Protection
13 Mitigation and Enhancement. I'm going blank. I say
14 PM&E all the time, and I know when I use acronyms
15 with an audience, they confuse. But there's no PM&E
16 measures that are proposed at this time for
17 threatened and endangered species of the project,
18 because at this point in time, we don't believe
19 there's any threatened and endangered species out
20 there.

21 Recreational land use, with agency approval,
22 construct or refurbish trails to and around the
23 Sweetheart Creek anadromous reach from rock removed
24 from the tunnel construction for seasonal sport and
25 subsistence fishermen harvesting Sweetheart Lake
26 sockeye. It's very muddy out there. The trails are
27 really torn up. Bear trails have turned into mud

1 trails from human intervention. And with agency
2 approval, we would be willing to seed (sic) that
3 trails with rock. A question came up this morning
4 about the acidification of that rock, would it be
5 healthy rock to actually put on those trails. And of
6 course, that would need to be determined. But
7 assuming that the rock was of the proper chemical
8 composition and quality, this is something we, as
9 proponents, would be willing to do with agency
10 approval.

11 Under cultural resources, potential cultural
12 resource PM&E measures will be identified and
13 evaluated following the determination of
14 project-related effects.

15 Aesthetic resources, our proposed environmental
16 measures is to develop and implement a Scenery
17 Management Plan. To the extent that it is feasible,
18 construct the powerhouse in-ground, like we -- like I
19 mentioned before. And to minimize aesthetic and
20 sound impacts, and I discussed how we would use that
21 mound. Design the tailrace, again, to blend with the
22 existing habitat at Sweetheart Creek.

23 Construct the powerhouse access road and
24 transmission line from the dock to the powerhouse
25 behind the shore side tree line to minimize aesthetic
26 impacts. We've all seen roads built along a -- they
27 call them beach roads. We're not proposing to do a

1 beach road. We're proposing to do a road that is
2 behind the beach so that you would try to mitigate
3 its scenic impact from the Gilbert Bay.

4 Develop and implement a Hazardous Substances
5 Plan when we're in construction and during
6 maintenance.

7 Proposed environmental measures with the
8 socioeconomics, the potential socioeconomic resource
9 PM&E measures will be identified and evaluated
10 following determination of project-related effects.
11 Additional plans and measures proposed, develop and
12 implement a Fire Prevention Plan. And develop and
13 implement a Safety During Construction Plan that
14 would include wildlife interaction avoidance safety
15 components.

16 Alternatives to the proposed action, The
17 Environmental Assessment will consider and analyze
18 all recommendations for operation or facility
19 modifications, as well as for PM&E measures
20 identified the Commission, staff, federal, state and
21 resource agencies, Native Alaskan tribes, NGOs, and
22 the public.

23 Under the no-action alternative, the Commission
24 would deny a license for the proposed Sweetheart Lake
25 Hydroelectric Project. The project would not be
26 built and there would be no change to the existing
27 environment. Also, the no-action alternative is the

1 Commission's baseline environmental conditions for
2 comparising -- comparison with other alternatives.
3 And now, I'd like to turn it over to Ms. Harper and
4 she will cover some of the scope of the cumulative
5 effects and site specific resource issues.

6 MS. HARPER: Thanks. And again, just to sort of
7 reiterate what we're trying to accomplish with this
8 meeting here, this is our scoping document. And if
9 you want to follow along, we're going to pick up
10 starting.....

11 MS. RODMAN: Page 26.

12 MS. HARPER: Thank you. Page 26 with our
13 specific resource areas. Now, these bullets that
14 you'll see identified under each of the resource
15 areas, again, these are the things that we are going
16 to be looking at here at the Commission. And also,
17 Mr. Mitchell is going to be looking at as he prepares
18 his license application as to what types of effects
19 the project will have. So, as we go through these,
20 if you think of other issues that we need to be
21 examining, this is your opportunity to bring those to
22 our attention.

23 So, first is scope of cumulative effects. And
24 for those of you who aren't familiar with the term as
25 we use it, cumulative effects are effects on the
26 environment that result from the incremental effect
27 of the action, which in this case is building a

1 hydropower project and the associated transmission
2 lines, when added to other past, present and
3 reasonably foreseeable future effects. Right now, we
4 haven't -- as of scoping document one, we have not
5 identified any cumulative effects from the project.
6 But again, as we go through these individual resource
7 areas, if you think of a cumulative effect or
8 something that we need to look at as a cumulative
9 effect, this is your opportunity to let us know.

10 So, we're going to start with geology and soils.
11 And again, page 26, if you're following along. So,
12 the issues that have been identified so far are the
13 effects of project construction and operations on
14 geology and soils resources. The effects of project
15 construction and operation on reservoir shoreline
16 erosion and bank stability. The effects of project
17 construction and operation on existing mineral claims
18 and mining areas. And the effects of transmission
19 line construction on geology and soil resources. So,
20 at this point, I'd like it to open it up to the floor
21 if anyone has any other effects that you would like
22 to see analyzed. Yes? And please, for the record,
23 state name and speak clearly and loudly so our court
24 reporter can get your comments.

25 MR. LEIGHTY: Hi, Duff.

26 MR. MITCHELL: Hi, Bill.

27 MR. LEIGHTY: Bill Leighty. Sorry, just got off

1 my bike.

2 MR. MITCHELL: There you go. It's a good day.

3 MR. LEIGHTY: Now, are you considering adding a
4 saline gradient generated facility, which would
5 considerably increase the annual energy production?
6 And how much larger footprint would that require? Do
7 you know what I'm talking about?

8 MR. MITCHELL: I do. You're talking about how
9 you can transfer energy from the mix of the salinity
10 of the fresh water to the saltwater.

11 MR. LEIGHTY: You can generate energy that way.

12 MR. MITCHELL: Right.

13 MR. LEIGHTY: Course, it would be DC and you got
14 a AC converter. But how big a footprint does the
15 optimum size plant going in an edge up to your hydro
16 plant require and what does that do to the system
17 economics? Is it overwhelmingly attractive, and
18 therefore the footprint should be considered larger,
19 addressing the cumulative effects?

20 MR. MITCHELL: You know, Bill, nothing in our --
21 you know, nothing in our documents would go that
22 direction. It's definitely something that could be
23 considered in the future. At this point, we're
24 trying to mitigate our footprint, because of the
25 number of bears out there and the waterfall and the
26 unique characteristics of Gilbert Bay. I know you
27 and me have had these discussions on the salinity as

1 well as other forms of renewable energy.

2 And while that salinity fresh water conversion
3 is very interesting, in this scoping document, and
4 for what we're proposing, that would be what I would
5 say, out of the scope. If in such time, 25 years
6 down the road or some time where it looked like it
7 was feasible to take, not just ours, but any
8 hydropower facility that has freshwater inputs and
9 something, it may be considered at -- you know, at
10 some future point. But for the scoping for our
11 hydroelectric licensing, it -- we would not be
12 considering it at this point. Thank you.

13 MS. HARPER: Any other comments, questions, or
14 effects to be analyzed under geology and soils?
15 Okay. With that, I'm going to turn it over to Mr.
16 Ian Smith and let him talk to you about water
17 quantity and quality.

18 MR. SMITH: I'm Ian Smith. Again, we're on page
19 26 at the bottom there, section 4.2.2, water quantity
20 and quality. First bullet point is effects of
21 project construction on erosion, sedimentation,
22 turbidity, and we added nutrients this morning,
23 levels of Lower Sweetheart Lake, Sweetheart Creek,
24 Gilbert Bay, and the borrow sites of the project.

25 The second one is effects of project operation and
26 maintenance on changes to water temperature,
27 dissolved oxygen -- excuse me. Nutrients, dissolved

1 gas levels of Lower Sweetheart Lake, Sweetheart
2 Creek, and we added Gilbert Bay and the borrow site
3 this morning.

4 Then moving on to page 27, effects of
5 contamination via accidental releases of fuels,
6 lubricants, and other wastes from construction
7 equipment, machinery and operations on Lower
8 Sweetheart Lake, Sweetheart Creek, and Gilbert Bay
9 water quality. And then the effects of project
10 construction, operation and maintenance on Sweetheart
11 Creek flows. So, are there any comments, questions
12 on that section?

13 All right. Moving on to the next one, 4.2.3 on
14 page 27, aquatic resources. The effects of project
15 construction and -- excuse me. Effects of project
16 construction, operation, and maintenance,
17 sedimentation, disturbances, modification on the
18 physical habitat of Lower Sweetheart Lake, Sweetheart
19 Creek and Gilbert Bay. And then this morning, we
20 also included the affected areas of the flooding of
21 Lower Sweetheart Lake and the -- and we're going to
22 include the tributaries to Lower Sweetheart Lake, as
23 well.

24 Effects of project operation and water level
25 fluctuations on fish species and habitats in Lower
26 Sweetheart Lake. Effects of project operation and
27 maintenance, including alterations to existing flow

1 regime on fish species, aquatic hab -- and aquatic
2 habitats of Sweetheart Lake. Effects of project
3 operation, including alterations to existing flow
4 regime of Sweetheart Creek, on fish and shellfish,
5 including benthic aquatic communities in Gilbert Bay.
6 Effects of submarine transmission line construction
7 on fish and -- fish, shellfish, and benthic
8 communities in Gilbert Bay.

9 Effects of project construction and operation
10 and maintenance on marine mammals in Gilbert Bay and
11 Port Snett -- excuse me, Snettisham. And then we've
12 added a few additional bullet points this morning, as
13 well. And those are the effects of construction,
14 operation, maintenance of out migration of sockeye
15 from Lower Sweetheart Lake. The effects of
16 construction, operation, and maintenance of the
17 personal use fishery at Sweetheart Creek and Gilbert
18 Bay. Impacts of changes in the sockeye populations.
19 And then we're going to add a note about what
20 potential effects will the project have on Upper
21 Sweetheart Lake, which are minimal, but we'll add a
22 statement about that. So, are there any additional
23 comments to aquatic resources? Monte?

24 MR. MILLER: My name is Monte Miller, I'm the
25 Statewide Hydropower Coordinator for the Alaska
26 Department of Fish and Game. Duff mentioned the
27 tailrace construction. And I think it would probably

1 pertinent to also state that potential fish habitat
2 created by your tailrace would not be for sockeye, it
3 would be for spawning the pinks and chums. So,
4 there's two different issues here that I think need
5 to be noted. And that's all I have to say.

6 MR. MITCHELL: Yeah, you're -- Mon -- just for
7 the audience, Monte's -- Mr. Miller's absolutely
8 correct. Those sockeye are a no deposit, no return
9 fishery. The increased habitat would be for the
10 anadromous fish that do use Sweetheart Creek for
11 spawning.

12 MR. FLUETSCH: Tape timeout.

13 MR. SMITH: And I think -- oh, excuse me.

14 MR. FLUETSCH: Ian, can we have a tape timeout?

15 MR. SMITH: Oh, yeah. Sorry Brad.

16 MR. MITCHELL: I was trying to get that in there
17 real quick.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, excellent timing.

19 MR. MITCHELL: And for those of you that aren't
20 fish heads, anadromous are the fish that come in and
21 spawn in the salt and fresh -- come in from the
22 saltwater and spawn in the fresh water.

23 MR. FLUETSCH: We're good to go.

24 MR. SMITH: Time in?

25 MR. FLUETSCH: Time in.

26 MR. SMITH: Right on. Monte, to address that
27 comment, it's a good point. I think it would fall

1 under the third bullet there, the effects of project
2 operation, including the al -- maintenance, including
3 alterations to the flow regime on fish species and
4 aquatic habitats of Sweetheart Creek. So, it will be
5 addressed under that third bullet point.

6 MR. MILLER: I just -- my point being.....

7 MR. SMITH: No, exactly, it's.....

8 MR. MILLER:that the.....

9 MR. SMITH:yeah, it's stated.

10 MR. MILLER:intertidal spawning fish.....

11 MR. SMITH: Sure.

12 MR. MILLER:are treated differently
13 than.....

14 MR. SMITH: Yeah, that's a natural spawning,
15 those.....

16 MR. MILLER:the out migrant.....

17 MR. SMITH:two species.

18 MR. MILLER:put and take fishery.

19 MR. SMITH: Yep. Thank you. Any additional
20 comments on aquatic resources? So.....

21 MS. RODMAN: Okay. Terrestrial resources.
22 Effects of habitat loss and alteration from
23 construction of the project facilities, all the
24 project facilities, including the transmission lines
25 and access roads, on wildlife and plant species, with
26 particular emphasis on Forest Service sensitive
27 species and state-listed species. Then the second

1 one is effects of noise, improved access from project
2 access roads, and increased human presence on
3 wildlife, again, with particular emphasis on Forest
4 Service sensitive species and state-listed species.

5 Then we have a bullet -- gee, I can't remember
6 if we modified this from -- based on the morning
7 meeting. Effects of project construction and
8 operation on migratory and shore birds -- I've got
9 those notes in my backpack, which don't help right
10 now, in and adjacent to the project area. I do
11 remember the next bullet, we did modify. That was
12 effects of the new substation and transmission line
13 on the potential for raptor and water fowl
14 electrocution and collisions. Because the
15 transmission line segments are going to so close to
16 Gilbert Bay that they could easily have an effect on
17 water fowl.

18 Effect of project construction and operation,
19 that is lake level fluctuations, remember, we're
20 talking about an annual fluctuation of 60 feet, on
21 Lower Sweetheart Lake, including at the Upper
22 Sweetheart Lake Creek and Sweetheart Creek shoreline
23 vegetation and/or habitats used by wildlife species.
24 And the last one is effects of project construction
25 and operation, again, the lake level fluctuations,
26 plus potential effects of project roads, and other
27 facilities on distribution and abundance of invasive

1 plant species. Does anybody have comments about the
2 terrestrial resource bullets? Did we miss an impact?
3 Is there something that you think we ought to modify
4 a bullet in any way? No? Yes, Monte?

5 MR. MILLER: Monte Miller, Fish and Game. This
6 morning, did we add the intertidal.....

7 MS. RODMAN: You're right.

8 MR. MILLER:to this area?

9 MS. RODMAN: That's right. Yes, that was the
10 one. Right. Let's see, we've got the second to the
11 last.

12 MR. MILLER: The effects of transmission
13 line.....

14 MS. RODMAN: Oh, right.

15 MR. MILLER:crossing intertidal areas.

16 MS. RODMAN: Okay.

17 MR. MILLER: The shorelines and intertidal.

18 MS. RODMAN: Thank you. Okay. All right.
19 Anybody else? Okay. Then I'm also going to take the
20 threatened and endangered species bullet, although
21 Ian and I will work on that jointly. It's effects of
22 project construction and operation on federally
23 listed threatened and endangered species that may
24 occur in the project area. When we get both -- I
25 can't say for sure what Mr. Mitchell will do. But
26 what I intend to do when we do our environmental
27 analysis is, in this section, I'm going to be

1 discussing species that are actually protected under
2 the Endangered Species Act, which in Alaska is not
3 that many. We do have the humpback whale, we do have
4 the sea lion.....

5 MR. MILLER: Steller Sea Lion.

6 MS. RODMAN:Steller Sea Lion, right. So,
7 they would be treated in this section. Federally
8 designated candidate species, we would probably
9 discuss under terrestrial resources. They're not
10 protected under the Endangered Species Act. And it
11 may seem like a detail, but legally, it's extremely
12 important. But it -- we will address candidate
13 species. As somebody pointed out this morning,
14 candidate species are also Forest Service sensitive
15 species. So, they fit quite nicely into what we had
16 already planned to do for terrestrial resources.

17 Again, does anybody have any alterations to that
18 bullet or any information on threatened and
19 endangered species that we hadn't known about? Yes?

20 MR. MILLER: Did we add EMF to that? Monte
21 Miller, Fish and Game. Did we add electromagnetic
22 fields to that with your marine.....

23 MS. RODMAN: Oh, that was -- I think that was
24 under aquatic resources.

25 MR. MILLER: We were doing it in a couple
26 different places.

27 MS. RODMAN: Yeah, I think that -- we put that

1 at.....

2 MR. SMITH: We discussed it, actually under
3 towards the end.

4 MR. MILLER: It could also apply to your
5 endangered species.

6 MR. SMITH: Yeah, and it could also apply to
7 aquatic.....

8 MR. MILLER: And aquatic, yeah.

9 MR. SMITH:resource.

10 MS. RODMAN: Yeah. So, EMF? Okay. All right.
11 What we mean by EMF, if anybody is not familiar with
12 that term, is electromagnetic frequency. Basically,
13 a transmission line does have a electromagnetic
14 effect surrounding it. And that can effect certain
15 animals. Sometimes it messes up their navigation or
16 causes avoidance. And so, that is something that we
17 can look -- we can and will look at. Does anybody
18 else have any concerns like that? No? Okay.

19 MS. HARPER: Okay. Fantastic. Thanks, Dianne.
20 We have another member of our team who,
21 unfortunately, could not be with us tonight, Ken
22 Wilcox (ph), who will be handling recreation and
23 cultural resources for this project. Since he's not
24 here, I'm going to run through the issues and just
25 try to bring back up some things we discussed this
26 morning as they're pertinent.

27 So, so far the issues that have been identified

1 under recreation and land use, the adequacy of
2 existing recreation facilities and public access
3 within the project boundary to meet current and
4 future recreational demand. The effects on
5 recreation resources in the vicinity of the project,
6 including semi-remote recreation opportunities and
7 water based recreation in Gilbert Bay. The
8 feasibility of providing new recreation facilities or
9 improving existing facilities located within the
10 project boundary. And the effect of construction and
11 operation of a transmission line on recreation
12 resources.

13 Evaluating the compatibility of the project with
14 the semi-remote land use designation for the area.
15 And also, the effects of project operation and
16 maintenance on other land use activities, including
17 hunting and trapping, in the vicinity of the project.
18 And for those of you who were not with us this
19 morning, we did discuss also adding in the personal
20 use fishery information and that that's something
21 that we would look at. And also, what types of
22 recreation could potentially be allowed that still,
23 again, fit within the land use designation. Also,
24 the -- okay. That's actually under socioeconomics.
25 I think that's all of the additional recreation.
26 Were there any others that I.....

27 (Whispered conversation)

1 MS. HARPER: Right. And within the recreation,
2 also making sure that while outfitters and guides
3 were mentioned explicitly within the scoping
4 document, making sure that some of the other
5 individual recreationalists are contacted and
6 surveyed, as well, to get their usage information.
7 Are there any other comments, questions, additions
8 from the audience? Yes, Monte?

9 MR. MILLER: Monte Miller, Fish and Game. On
10 another project in Southeastern Alaska, they had
11 difficulty with getting information. One of the
12 things they have done is put up trail cams.

13 MS. HARPER: Uh-huh (affirmative).

14 MR. MILLER: Which is providing them, not only
15 information on people, but actually they were quite
16 surprised to see wildlife using the trails.

17 MS. HARPER: Uh-huh (affirmative).

18 MR. MILLER: In discussions with the project
19 applicant, they said they review the trail cam and
20 it's people, people, bear, people, moose, moose,
21 deer, people, people, moose, deer.

22 MS. HARPER: Uh-huh (affirmative).

23 MR. MILLER: So, they're getting a lot of
24 additional information, which, you know, might be
25 very interesting to look at from.....

26 MS. HARPER: Uh-huh (affirmative).

27 MR. MILLER:additional standpoints. It's

1 an inexpensive way to make counts. And you don't
2 have to have somebody present to do it. As long as
3 you secure the thing quite well.

4 MS. HARPER: And as you go through your study
5 plans, that may -- I think that might make it --
6 covered under study plans discussions.

7 MR. MILLER: Yeah. Yeah, really secure a
8 camera, because bears do like to play with them.

9 MS. RODMAN: So do recreationists.

10 MS. HARPER: Ah, yes. So, were there any other
11 comments from the audience in terms of things we
12 should be looking at in terms of recreation resources
13 in the area? Okay. On to cultural, then. First
14 bullet under cultural.....

15 MS. RODMAN: Aesthetics.

16 MS. HARPER: Oh, I'm sorry. Thank you, Dianne.
17 Completely skipped aesthetics. Effects of project
18 construction, facilities, and operation on the
19 aesthetic values in the vicinity of the project,
20 including Lower Sweetheart Lake, Sweetheart Creek,
21 areas visible from Gilbert Bay, and areas along the
22 transmission line corridor. So, basically, all of
23 the project facilities. And the effects of noise and
24 lighting in the project area resulting from
25 construction, operation, and maintenance of the
26 project. Were there any other changes or additions
27 to what we're going to be examining for the aesthetic

1 impacts of this project?

2 MS. DROBNICA: I just have a question.

3 MS. HARPER: Can you state your name, please?

4 MS. DROBNICA: My name is Angel Drobnica. Will
5 the upper falls be dry completely or will there be
6 water flow allowed to maintain any scenic values?

7 MR. MITCHELL: You're talking about on the
8 Sweetheart Falls itself.....

9 MS. DROBNICA: Yeah.

10 MR. MITCHELL:not the upper lake, but the
11 Sweetheart Falls?

12 MS. DROBNICA: The barrier falls.

13 MR. MITCHELL: Yeah. The -- that's a good
14 question. It's going to be reduced substantially. I
15 don't know if it would be dried or if it would be
16 just substantially reduced. I think our plan is to
17 borrow the water and put it in down there below the
18 barrier falls. So, there would be a decrease in what
19 flows over the barrier falls. I don't know what that
20 would look like at this point, based on stream flow
21 regimes that we need to -- you know, there may be a
22 requirement to keep a certain amount of cubic feet
23 per second in there. There may also be a natural
24 amount of water that flows from the cavern to the
25 sides that would end up in that creek that don't --
26 that doesn't come from the lake, as well. That would
27 be producing, you know, water as it flows. But

1 there's a potential that it will de-water a good
2 chunk of that -- the falls.

3 MS. DROBNICA: So, this -- we'll know more after
4 the stream gauging that's taking place at the end of
5 next year?

6 MR. MITCHELL: The hydrology, yes.

7 MS. DROBNICA: Okay.

8 MS. HARPER: So, in terms of the bullet, do you
9 want to see specifically the barrier falls identified
10 as an area of aesthetic effects?

11 MS. DROBNICA: Yes.

12 MS. HARPER: Okay.

13 MS. DROBNICA: Okay.

14 MS. HARPER: Okay.

15 MS. RODMAN: This is Dianne Rodman. I was
16 thinking of an additional bullet that might be the
17 effects of flow diversions on aesthetics of the
18 barrier falls. How does -- does that characterize it
19 well?

20 MS. DROBNICA: Yes. Thank you.

21 MS. RODMAN: Okay. Great. Monte?

22 MR. MILLER: Monte Miller. To address that same
23 issue, there is filed with DNR, a request for
24 reservation of water by the Alaska Department of Fish
25 and Game, which is yet to be adjudicated. It will
26 take a preference position, and due to date filing,
27 that needs to be investigated. And DNR will allow

1 water, based on what's left after reservations of
2 water. So, there should be always some water in that
3 stream, based on that reservation.

4 MR. MITCHELL: I agree. But I'll also add that
5 it's a non-consumptive use and the Fish and Game
6 application covers the anadromous reach, which
7 doesn't -- which does not include the barrier -- the
8 upper.....

9 MR. MILLER: It's entirely possible.

10 MR. MITCHELL: Yeah.

11 MR. MILLER: That it may not be the -- you know,
12 it may be the lower reach. The only concern I would
13 have would be.....

14 MR. MITCHELL: I just want to state that out for
15 factual.

16 MR. MILLER: No, no, no, whatever input from
17 that -- from the bypass reach regarding nutrients and
18 things to help production in that lower reach would
19 -- it -- we would consider environmentally important,
20 as well. Because your water's going to be drawn from
21 way down deep in the lake and will presumably lack a
22 lot of the surface nutrients that would be -- would
23 naturally occur.

24 MS. HARPER: So, would that be captured in
25 bullet one where.....

26 MR. MILLER: I think it -- yeah.

27 MS. HARPER: Okay.

1 MR. MILLER: I don't think there's anything
2 additional that needs to be stated.

3 MS. HARPER: Okay. Okay. Thanks.

4 MR. MILLER: I'm just trying to put information
5 out so that.....

6 MS. HARPER: Oh, sure.

7 MR. MILLER:people have that information,
8 as well.

9 MS. HARPER: Okay. Were there any other
10 additions or comments on aesthetic values? Okay.
11 Great. We'll go onto cultural, and again, page 29
12 for those of you reading along. So, effects of
13 project construction and operation on the project's
14 area of potential effects. Area potential effects is
15 a specific term that we use. And the area potential
16 effects is not necessarily the project boundary.
17 Depending on the specific project, it could be a
18 completely different size and shape than the project
19 boundary. But the APE, the area of potential
20 effects, would be defined as part of the
21 environmental analysis document. So, again, the
22 cultural resources could potentially expand beyond
23 the project boundary, depending on the project.

24 Effects of project construction and operation on
25 historic and archeological resources that are listed
26 or considered eligible for inclusion in the National
27 Historic -- National Register of Historic Places.

1 I've messed that up both times I've said it today.
2 Effects of project construction and operation on
3 properties of traditional religious and cultural
4 importance to Native Alaskan tribes. Effects of
5 project construction and operation on subsistence
6 resources, including hunting, fishing, and gathering
7 and associated areas.

8 And also, we're going to include a discussion on
9 the effects to the personal use fishery of Sweetheart
10 Creek under cultural resources. And I just want to
11 refer to my notes real quick and make sure that there
12 was no other significant changes we made this morning
13 under cultural. Okay. I'm not seeing any other
14 significant notes that we made from this morning. Do
15 you guys remember any significant changes to
16 cultural?

17 MR. SMITH: Not today.

18 MS. HARPER: Okay. Do you have any changes,
19 additions, things you'd like to see under cultural?

20 MR. FFUETSCH: The.....

21 MS. HARPER: Oh, your name, please.

22 MR. FLUETSCH: My name is Brad Fluetsch, Juneau
23 resident. I find it completely offensive that a
24 hatchery useless fish run planted by DIPAC be
25 considered at equal to subsistence resources. This
26 is not a personal use fishery, this is just like a
27 waste of fish that Juneau gets to go use. It's only

1 been around for 10, 20 years. So, I think if you're
2 going to put it somewhere, it does not belong
3 anywhere near cultural, or even equivalent to
4 subsistence resources. Thank you.

5 MS. HARPER: So, you would recommend.....

6 MR. FLUETSCH: I object to it. It should be
7 just thrown out, because it's just a completely
8 useless fishery. It's a recreational fishery. And
9 it's of no historic or cultural value. It is
10 completely a manufactured, manmade fictitious
11 fishery.

12 MR. MITCHELL: I would like to just point out
13 that Mr. Fluetsch here, in addition to being a
14 videographer, is a former ANB president -- Alaska
15 Native Brotherhood president of.....

16 MR. FLUETSCH: And current Grand Treasurer of
17 the Alaska Native Brotherhood.

18 MR. MITCHELL: And as we discussed earlier in
19 the agency meetings, when you cross personal use with
20 subsistence, you bring out high levels of
21 perspectives in Southeast Alaska. And I think what
22 he's mentioning is that when you're talking about
23 cultural and you're talking about subsistence.....

24 MS. HARPER: Uh-huh (affirmative).

25 MR. MITCHELL:those are very, very deep to
26 people who have been doing that for 10,000 years.
27 And he's just trying to -- maybe that this issue

1 should not be put underneath the cultural aspects.
2 It could still be addressed somewhere else in
3 the.....

4 MS. HARPER: In the recreation?

5 MR. SMITH: Recreation.

6 MR. MITCHELL: Yes.

7 MS. RODMAN: Socioeconomics? We were also
8 thinking socioeconomics.

9 MS. HARPER: Yes, and also the socioeconomics.
10 Okay. Yeah. Okay. Yes?

11 MR. MILLER: This is Monte Miller, Fish and
12 Game. I would like to point out that under the FERC
13 regulations, all uses of a resource of a water system
14 are to be considered equally and given equal
15 consideration. That was changed in the 1980s in the
16 FERC laws, and I think it needs to be brought up that
17 those uses are current and existing. You know, DIPAC
18 is a commercial venture. What they do is in
19 association and conjunction with Fish and Game and
20 operations and management. And I think that it,
21 under the law, deserves equal consideration, based on
22 the FERC rulings and changes in the law back in the
23 1980s.

24 MR. BROOKS: Right. And -- this is Keith Brooks
25 from FERC. And we would consider that just to -- and
26 I think the question that Mr. Fluetsch had is whether
27 it's under cultural.

1 MR. MILLER: I.....

2 MR. BROOKS: So, we would examine it and we
3 would, you know, abide by.....

4 MR. MILLER: I do -- I am sensitive to cultural.
5 My father was a member of the Alaska Native
6 Brotherhood, as well. I have many family members who
7 are registered shareholders in Native corporations.
8 And so, I am very sensitive to it, as an Alaskan born
9 and raised in Southeast Alaska. This is a lifestyle
10 that has gone on for 10,000 years, subsistence. And
11 I do recognize that and give it full credence. So,
12 please understand that. I'm not making statements
13 against what you said. It's just that from a
14 resource standpoint, I think we have to -- we -- you
15 know, we have to look at all uses.

16 MR. BROOKS: Right. And we weren't throwing it
17 out, we were putting it into another.....

18 MR. MILLER: No, I understand that.

19 MR. BROOKS:box, and that's all.

20 MR. MILLER: And the statement that.....

21 MR. BROOKS: So, we agree with what you're
22 saying.

23 MR. MILLER: That statement that preceded mine,
24 basically.....

25 MR. BROOKS: Okay.

26 MR. MILLER:asked for it to be completely
27 thrown out. And I don't think that's allowable under

1 existing FERC policy.

2 MS. HARPER: Okay. Were there any other
3 cultural issues that we should be looking at
4 potential project effects? Okay. All right.
5 Socioeconomics, effects of project construction and
6 operation on local, tribal, and regional economies.
7 Effects of the submarine cable transmission route on
8 commercial harvesters of salmon, crab and shrimp.
9 And the effects of the project on local guides and
10 outfitters. And again, and maybe this is a better
11 place to put the personal use fishery aspects. And
12 let's see, also effects to navigation were added this
13 morning within Gilbert Bay. Again, we have the
14 transmission line. So, we want to make sure that we
15 capture any effects to navigation. Let's see. And -
16 - okay. Were there any other socioeconomic effects
17 of the project that anyone wanted.....

18 MR. BAILEY: Todd Bailey, commercial fisherman.
19 I couldn't quite -- from the map, is it an underwater
20 cable going across the entrance to Snettisham, as
21 well?

22 MR. MITCHELL: I'll let -- if I can go back to
23 the map, I'll -- it's easier to show with the map.
24 This is not the entrance of Port Snettisham, this is
25 the entrance right here. So, it is about halfway.

26 MR. BAILEY: Okay. And is that under water
27 there, or.....

1 MR. MITCHELL: Yeah, this is submerged.

2 MR. BAILEY: Because in some of the previous
3 ones, it only talked about the underwater section of
4 Gilbert Bay.

5 MR. MITCHELL: Right. And there's actually --
6 with the overland route, there would be submerged
7 sections, one from the dock, across, and another one
8 here. And alternative two, would be the entire
9 submerged route that way.

10 MR. BAILEY: And I couldn't, like I said,
11 couldn't tell, but I was going to say that that Mist
12 Island anchorage is often used by tenders.

13 MR. MITCHELL: Right there?

14 MR. BAILEY: I couldn't tell if it was going to
15 be.....

16 MR. MITCHELL: It's going to be north of there.
17 And the reason that's selected, and not to interfere
18 with tender operators, was because that's where the
19 Snettisham line comes down low and it's easier to
20 connect, as opposed to try to run another line up a
21 steep slope with that picture.

22 MS. RODMAN: What was the scale on that -- I was
23 trying to read the scale on the bottom of what you
24 were showing before. How.....

25 MR. MITCHELL: That's two miles.

26 MS. RODMAN: Okay. Two miles there. Is it a
27 mile from that.....

1 MR. MITCHELL: Yeah, it's just north of there.
2 Maybe a quarter of a mile or -- yeah, quarter.
3 Somewhere in that vicinity.

4 MS. RODMAN: Okay.

5 MS. HARPER: So, were there any additional -- I
6 mean, we have a bullet for effects of the submarine
7 cable transmission route on commercial harvesters of
8 salmon, crab, and fi.....

9 MS. RODMAN: Shrimp.

10 MS. HARPER:shrimp. Thank you.

11 MR. BAILEY: I guess it was just clarification I
12 was looking for.

13 MS. HARPER: Oh, okay. Thanks.

14 MR. MITCHELL: Do, they -- just for my
15 knowledge, do the tenders go in here in this little
16 cutout, or are they out?

17 MR. BAILEY: Yeah, they go in there and there's
18 one on the other side, too, that they use.

19 MR. MITCHELL: Over here?

20 MR. BAILEY: No, on the other side.

21 MR. MITCHELL: Oh, like over.....

22 MR. BAILEY: Yeah.

23 MR. MITCHELL: Okay.

24 MS. HARPER: Okay. Any other comments,
25 questions, or additions or changes? Okay. Last is
26 developmental resources. And within our
27 environmental documents, we have a chapter where we

1 look at the various economics of the project. We
2 look at how much the project cost to build, how much
3 it cost to operate, and then for every measure that's
4 put in, every protection, mitigation, and enhancement
5 measure, we look at the cost of each of those. Then
6 we look at how much power the project produces, and
7 we try to determine with our internal models, how
8 much -- what the effect of these items would be on
9 the amount of money that the power produced would be.

10 And then for any environmental measure, such as
11 flows through the bypass reach, you know, if it's
12 going down the bypass reach, it's not going through
13 the turbine. So, that could have an effect on
14 generation. So, we also consider that within the
15 developmental resources chapter. So, having given
16 you that context of what specifically we're talking
17 about for this, we look at the effects of any
18 recommended environmental measures on project
19 generation and economics. And the effect of project
20 construction, operation, and maintenance on the
21 project's economics.

22 So, again, these are things that we do look at.
23 So, the other economic measures, typically, are dealt
24 with in the socioeconomics. This is -- these are the
25 measures that lead to our model that we use. But
26 having said that, are there any other items,
27 questions, comments, clarifications that you have

1 about these measures?

2 You know, the -- it's one of the considerations
3 is to -- for every measure proposed, that measure
4 does have a cost. And so, we do look at that as part
5 of the balancing when we're looking at evaluating the
6 license.

7 So, that, again, is the issues that have been
8 identified that are going to be looked at in the
9 environmental analysis section. Now that you've had
10 a chance to sort of hear them all, does anyone have
11 any questions, comments, or additions that you'd like
12 to bring up now? Yes?

13 MR. YOUNG: I have a question on.....

14 MS. HARPER: Oh, name, please. Sorry.

15 MR. YOUNG: Dale Young.

16 MS. HARPER: Okay.

17 MR. YOUNG: Just a concerned citizen. I have a
18 question on what you just -- were just discussing on
19 your model and the economic impacts. Does your model
20 include the benefit of this energy produced in areas
21 distant from this location? In other words, the fact
22 that energy is created here.....

23 MS. HARPER: Uh-huh (affirmative).

24 MR. YOUNG:in a clean method.....

25 MS. HARPER: Uh-huh (affirmative).

26 MR. YOUNG:offsetting, maybe, not so clean
27 energy methods somewhere else in the country. Is

1 there any way in the model that that's already --
2 that that's taken into account, given some sort of
3 value?

4 MS. HARPER: Right. We do not give that an
5 explicit value within the model, but we do discuss
6 that in very general terms in our need for power
7 section. And so, it is addressed within the
8 document. But in terms of -- are you discussing
9 carbon offsets or.....

10 MR. YOUNG: Not carbon offsets, just the fact
11 that a clean energy is available that would -- well,
12 it's offsetting carbon, I guess. It's offsetting
13 fuel. But I'm not looking at it in the carbon offset
14 terminology. Just the fact that we're producing
15 energy here means somewhere in the world, there's
16 going to be a benefit, maybe to fish and wildlife,
17 you know. You know, we're looking at the potential
18 damage to resources as this project is developed.
19 But there may be advantages in other parts of the
20 country in addition. I mean, very difficult to
21 measure here.

22 MS. HARPER: Right.

23 MR. YOUNG: But I was just curious if your model
24 had anything like that.

25 MS. HARPER: It's not accounted for within that
26 model. But we -- again, we do discuss it in our need
27 for power section, which comes earlier in the

1 document.

2 MS. DROBNICA: Angel Drobnica. I was wondering,
3 could you elaborate more on what you're looking for
4 with -- on your need for power?

5 MS. HARPER: Under our need for power?

6 MS. DROBNICA: Yeah.

7 MS. HARPER: Typically, when we are looking at
8 our need for power, we have energy projections that
9 we look at over a 10 year time frame.

10 MS. DROBNICA: Uh-huh (affirmative).

11 MS. HARPER: And we look at how much power is
12 currently being produced, what the anticipated need
13 is going to be 10 years down the road. And then how
14 is that need potentially going to be filled? And
15 bringing on new sources of power, hydropower is an
16 option for addressing how those needs are going to be
17 filled. Our need for power section's typically not
18 terribly extensive. But that's the crux of it, is
19 looking at projected need 10 years down the road.

20 MS. DROBNICA: So, would you be looking at --
21 would this be a regional base, as far as Juneau,
22 specific? Or would you be looking at a wider.....

23 MS. HARPER: It's a wider, we have -- it -- the
24 country's split into 10 regions. And so, we would be
25 looking at the region that Alaska is within.

26 MS. DROBNICA: Okay. So, even with our limited
27 -- or isolated transmission lines right now, you'd be

1 looking at a broader.....

2 MS. HARPER: Right. Because to give consistency
3 to our documents, we rely on NERC's forecast. And
4 they do it on a regional basis. And I don't think
5 they split it down to -- they do have some sub-
6 regions that they look at. But I don't think they
7 split it down to, say, a Juneau need for power. But
8 again, if this is something that needs specifically
9 to be addressed, because this is such an unusual --
10 you know, not having the grid, per say. Then that's
11 something that we can definitely look at.

12 MS. RODMAN: Jen, what is NERC?

13 MS. HARPER: Oh -- yeah, it's the -- shoot. I
14 actually have a friend who works for NERC. We won't
15 tell them I forgot. I believe it's the National
16 Energy Reliability Commission.

17 MR. BROOKS: Council.

18 MR. MITCHELL: Council.

19 MS. HARPER: Council. Thank you, thank you.
20 Council. But yeah, they do the 10 year forecast.

21 MR. BROOKS: They do a reliability around the
22 entire country, that's what they've gotten a lot of
23 exposure recently, positive and negative.

24 MS. DROBNICA: Are they government or.....

25 MR. BROOKS: No, they're a private industry
26 related organization.

27 MS. HARPER: So, potentially, adding a bullet

1 under need for power that the specifics of Juneau's
2 need for power.

3 MS. DROBNICA: The whole south -- the whole
4 region of Southeast.

5 MS. HARPER: Southeast?

6 MS. DROBNICA: Yeah.

7 MS. HARPER: Okay.

8 MS. DROBNICA: In regards to the limited
9 transmission capabilities.

10 MR. SANFORD: And just -- Merrill Sanford. Just
11 for your information, Southeast region --it's true
12 the Alaska Energy Authority has a big contract,
13 \$800,000 dollars, to look at the hydropower and
14 natural powers of wind and geothermal and all of
15 that. And they're doing that right now, and they're
16 going to have a report done in January, a basic
17 report, of the hydro projects along in November. And
18 so, in that report with Black and Veatch will be the
19 power loads.....

20 MS. HARPER: Okay.

21 MR. SANFORD:for Southeast Alaska and the
22 communities within Southeast Alaska. And then the
23 projected power loads on out. So, you'll have a much
24 more current estimate of what our needs and
25 availability is to meet those needs with a hydropower
26 or the other natural sources that we have.....

27 MS. HARPER: Okay.

1 MR. SANFORD: within our reach hear in
2 Southeast.

3 MS. HARPER: And you said that report would be
4 publicly available January 2012?

5 MR. SANFORD: January through February, it
6 should be completed.

7 MS. HARPER: Okay. That's.....

8 MR. SANFORD: November, there'll be a
9 preliminary draft given to the legislature so they
10 can start working on dollars and cents of it.

11 MS. HARPER: Okay. That's good information.
12 Thank you.

13 MR. SANFORD: And this is one of those projects
14 that are in that report.

15 MS. HARPER: Oh, okay.

16 MR. SANFORD: Sweetheart. Right now, anyway.

17 MS. HARPER: Okay. Were there any other? Okay.
18 Fantastic. In that case, I'll turn it back over to
19 you.

20 MR. MITCHELL: This is a component that we
21 didn't get through earlier today. So, this is the
22 first time it's being seen for those that sat through
23 the earlier agency meeting session. This part of the
24 agenda is where I'm going to go through the potential
25 studies that Juneau Hydropower is going to address,
26 based on the comments that were made on the PAD.

27 MS. HARPER: Let me ask you one quick question.

1 Would now potentially be a good time to offer people
2 an opportunity to take a break.

3 MR. MITCHELL: Absolutely. Absolutely.

4 MS. HARPER: Yeah, since we're about to totally
5 change facets.....

6 MR. MITCHELL: Switch gears.

7 MS. HARPER:why don't we take a five
8 minute break so if anybody needs to freshen up get a
9 drink or help themselves to something from the back.
10 And we'll meet back at five till.

11 (Off record)

12 MS. HARPER: Quick thing. Some of you came n
13 after we got started. If you haven't filled out one
14 of these, if you would do so before you leave, that
15 would be greatly appreciated. We have a stack of
16 them here. Does anybody need one that didn't get one
17 earlier?

18 (Whispered conversation)

19 MS. HARPER: Sure. We've got someone who needs
20 to leave that would like to make a comment before you
21 get started on studies. So.....

22 MR. MITCHELL: Why don't -- let's have a round
23 of comments for those that need to -- that like to
24 depart.

25 MS. HARPER: Everyone else get one of these who
26 needed it? Okay. Fantastic. All right. And also,
27 for latecomers, does anybody need a copy of the

1 scoping document that did not get one? Okay. Great.
2 Thank you.

3 MR. MITCHELL: Did you want to make comments?

4 MS. EVERSON: Oh, yes.

5 MR. MITCHELL: Yeah, go.

6 MS. EVERSON: Okay. My name is Patricia Everson
7 with -- I live in Juneau, Alaska. And this is the
8 first time I've ever been to a meeting like this, so
9 it's really interesting to see the process from the
10 be -- well, I guess it's not the beginning, but near
11 the beginning. I wanted to thank you for coming to
12 Alaska and looking into this. As an Alaska Native,
13 my mother -- we grew up in -- was born and raised in
14 Southeast Alaska. And one of -- I got to breath.

15 One of the things being raised in the Native
16 culture was being taught to respect the land, the
17 water, the air, the birds. And to see that you guys
18 are taking it very seriously and looking at all that
19 you're going to do to see how it impacts everything,
20 I just really appreciate it and want to thank you for
21 that.

22 But I do support something like this in the
23 village where my mother is from. They're
24 unemployment rate is so astronomically high. And
25 here, you know, although Alaska is better off than
26 the lower 48, the more economic stability we can
27 bring, and having the utilities available, I think is

1 only going to help Southeast Alaska.

2 And it's something that I look forward to
3 following on your websites, once I go there and log
4 on. But this is something that I really -- growing
5 up here, knowing how hard it is, especially in the
6 wintertime, depending on diesel is -- thank God for
7 the PFDs, Because mine goes right into that tank.
8 So, trying to get something to help our economy,
9 lowering the cost to run a business, to, you know,
10 build a home in our community. So, I just want to
11 thank you for your time and I look forward to
12 learning more and seeing more about this. Thank you.

13 MS. HARPER: Thank you.

14 MR. MITCHELL: Thank you. Would anybody else
15 like to make any comments that are thinking about
16 departing? Otherwise, we'll jump into the potential
17 study overview. Thank you. The overview of
18 potential studies -- I'm going to drive into
19 potential studies. Depending upon the findings of
20 studies completed by us and the recommendations of
21 the consulted entities, including yourself, Juneau
22 Hydropower will consider, and may propose other
23 measures to enhance environmental resources affected
24 by the project as part of the proposed action.

25 Juneau Hydropower's already issued a Cultural
26 Study Plan and a Terrestrial and Wetlands Study Plan.
27 Both of those have been on our website, and also on

1 the FERC site for quite some time. And those are out
2 there for review by the public and by agencies. And
3 we'll be issuing further study plans in the near
4 future. Excuse me.

5 I'm going to break these down in somewhat of the
6 same areas that we covered with -- that were broken
7 down earlier. So, we're going to cover geology and
8 soil resources first.

9 Under geotechnical study, we're going to query
10 with the U.S. Bureau of Land Management for any
11 mineral claims prior to building any structures or
12 otherwise blocking access to potentially valuable
13 deposits that have been claimed. We will contact a
14 any active mining claim owners that exist near the
15 project area borders to make sure that our project
16 -- hydropower project doesn't prevent them from
17 accessing or preclude them from developing their
18 claims. Right now, my initial research, and it's not
19 100 percent, but it's about 99.5 percent is that
20 there is no active claims on our project boundary.
21 There is claims in the surrounding areas. And my
22 initial query shows that we will not be impacting any
23 mining claim owners.

24 We will conduct historical area mining, research
25 the records, government research studies to locate
26 and assess the suitability of rock for tunneling, in
27 ground powerhouse, infrastructure development, safety

1 issues associated with rock formation as well as
2 locating rock that is suited for material usage.
3 We're planning on mixing rock with concrete and
4 making a dam. We want -- you cannot just use any
5 rock. You have to use rock that's suitable for that
6 purpose. So, we'll be researching and looking for
7 the -- locating rock up at the upper end of -- when I
8 say upper end, at the lake level, to determine if
9 there's suitability of rock.

10 We'll also be looking at the geotechnical -- the
11 desk reference of material that is out there for the
12 rock that's suitable for tunneling, as well as for
13 building the in ground powerhouse. There may be
14 something where, because of seismic activity and/or
15 faults and/or just the way the rock is prepared, that
16 even though our alternative is to build an in house
17 [sic] powerhouse, if it's unsafe or would cave in or
18 whatnot, you know, it may alter plans. So, that's
19 why we'd be looking at some of these factors. And
20 then that's like the third bullet, looking for
21 sufficient grade or use for the different
22 infrastructures.

23 We'll examine effects of land clearing and
24 ground disturbing activities during access to, use
25 of, and restoration of project construction sites
26 including borrow areas, disposal sites, laydown
27 areas, dock access road, transmission line, and other

1 infrastructure on erosion, sedimentation, and
2 shoreline stope -- slope stability. As we all know,
3 we live in a rainy area. It doesn't all come down
4 uniformly, so we have to make sure that as we look at
5 the effects of our land clearing, that we don't
6 create an erosion problem or landslide problem along
7 that short road that we're going to build or through
8 transmission line development. Mr. Miller?

9 MR. MILLER: Question on the geology. Monte
10 Miller, Fish and Game. Just to understand a little
11 better, your tunneling that you're planning on doing,
12 will the method of tunneling be determined by the
13 type of rock that you encounter, i.e., would you be
14 blasting or will you be boring tunnels? It makes a
15 difference on what you're waste material -- your take
16 out material is and suitability that material for
17 such things as trail building and road use.

18 MR. MITCHELL: Those are some factors. The
19 other factors is cost and the timeliness of the
20 project, depending on when we.....

21 MR. MILLER: And will those tunnels be lined?

22 MR. MITCHELL: What's that?

23 MR. MILLER: Do you anticipate having to line
24 some or part of the tunnel?

25 MR. MITCHELL: Some of the tunnel, the lower
26 part of the tunnel will be lined according to, you
27 know, the documents we put out. But a majority of it

1 will be unlined.

2 MR. MILLER: So, more to be determined later
3 when you determine the.....

4 MR. MITCHELL: Yeah, we're going to have -- when
5 we get the geology report and the engineer's reports
6 back, we'll have a better gauge of what is doable,
7 what isn't doable, and what their suggestions thereof
8 are. And of course, they look -- engineers look at
9 costs, as well.

10 MR. MILLER: Uh-huh (affirmative).

11 MR. MITCHELL: Okay. Moving on to water
12 potential studies. Water's broken down into two
13 areas, one is water quantity and one is water
14 quality. So, under the water quantity studies that
15 we're looking to do is perform hydrologic studies of
16 seasonal stream flow in Sweetheart Creek and Lower
17 Sweetheart Lake. These studies may be based on field
18 data and combined with historical USGS stream data
19 and referenced with measured data in nearby basins.
20 Examine and evaluate whether instream flow or lake
21 level regimes adopted during licensing would affect
22 existing permanent and conditional water rights in
23 the potentially affected waters. Evaluate and
24 document exact location of barrier falls and
25 relationship for Alaska Fish and Game water
26 reservation for the anadromous reach of Sweetheart
27 Creek.

1 Water quantity and water quality. There we go.
2 Under water quality, examined the characters of the
3 temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity of waters
4 affected by the project. Study will examine the
5 potential impact and mitigation of potential
6 construction and operational effects of water
7 quality. It's one thing to build something, but if
8 you're going to muddy up the creek for three years
9 and cause serious problems on the aquatic life -- you
10 may clean it up in three years, but you may have done
11 damage. So, we're not only going to be, you know,
12 looking at the long haul, but what are you going to
13 do in the short term and how are we going to mitigate
14 that during the construction period? These water
15 parameters are measured either continuously or
16 periodically using modern equipment capable of high
17 accuracy and reliability. Water quality surveys will
18 be conducted on Lower Sweetheart Lake.

19 We are working with a contractor to try to get
20 as much data as we can at our gauging stations. We
21 are running into difficulties with powering our
22 weather station at the top side, which would also
23 include some of our studies. What we are doing is
24 we're going to put a temperature array in, we can
25 take water bottle samples at different depths to find
26 out, you know, seasonality of what that water quali
27 -- what that qual -- water quality is. We are

1 looking to see how we can obtain that data through
2 mechanical means or through a more of a scientific
3 device. But we have not been able to ascertain the
4 exact equipment to do so at this time. We want to
5 review possible impacts on salt water marine life
6 from changes in timing of freshwater inputs to
7 including the ice formation in Gilbert Bay. I'm --
8 sorry, is there any questions on the water studies?

9 Moving on to aquatic resources overview. And
10 I'm going to break these down by geographical area of
11 the different water bodies. But the overview is we
12 want to conduct baseline surveys of fish species,
13 their habitats and general life histories in
14 potentially affected Lower Sweetheart Lake.
15 Additionally, study plans will include assessing
16 seasonal water fluctuations, access to inlet streams,
17 analyze inundation areas. Study plans for these
18 surveys will be developed in consultation with Alaska
19 state and federal resource agencies, including Alaska
20 Department of Fish and Game, Alaska Department of
21 Environmental Conservation, U.S. Forest Service,
22 National Marine Fisheries Service, and U.S. Fish and
23 Wildlife Service, and the Army Corps of Engineers.

24 In the Lower Sweetheart Lake, we're going to
25 analyze effects of raising water levels and
26 fluctuations of Lower Sweetheart Lake under proposed
27 operations. We also want to evaluate potential for

1 fish entrainment and impingement at intake. We want
2 to document populations, identify resident species
3 spawn habitat, identify and quantify littoral zone
4 inundation with increased reservoir, and evaluate
5 design of downstream passage facility for sockeye
6 smolt that are placed in there annually.

7 Under Sweetheart Creek, the fisheries studies
8 may include, but not be limited to creek observations
9 for summer and fall anadromous and determination of
10 resident fish surveys to estimate population,
11 distribution, and spawning area utilization and
12 timing. Examine water flow requirements for salmon
13 spawning and relationships between stream flows,
14 stream temperatures and life cycle habitat, inventory
15 and map existing stream habitat.

16 And the marine areas, which would be Gilbert Bay
17 and the mud flats out front of Sweetheart Creek.
18 These studies in these areas will attempt to estimate
19 the marine invertebrate and botanical resources in
20 areas potentially affected by the project's submarine
21 transmission line and possible changes to fresh water
22 discharge and affects in Gilbert Bay. And this would
23 include some of the things that were brought up today
24 with benthic zone and what.....

25 MR. SMITH: Uh-huh (affirmative). Yeah.

26 MR. MITCHELL: Dianne?

27 MS. RODMAN: For botanical resources, are you

1 looking at solely submerged, or are you also looking
2 at emergent plants?

3 MR. MITCHELL: On the submarine?

4 MS. RODMAN: Well, yeah.

5 MR. MITCHELL: In the marine areas?

6 MS. RODMAN: Right. Yes.

7 MR. MITCHELL: Yeah, I mean, in the marine
8 areas, obviously if it's going to -- if the
9 transmission line crosses that area, it's going to be
10 looked at. I'm trying to understand your question.
11 You're looking at the -- where the submarine cable
12 goes in and/or.....

13 MS. RODMAN: And the shoreline.

14 MR. MITCHELL: And the shoreline? Well, yeah,
15 any place that it crosses, we're going to be looking
16 at.

17 MS. RODMAN: Okay.

18 MR. MITCHELL: Yeah.

19 MS. RODMAN: Thank you.

20 MR. MITCHELL: Whether it's a submarine cable
21 that's being lowered into the water or whether it's a
22 transmission line, then it makes the submerging --
23 the connection.....

24 MS. RODMAN: The transmission?

25 MR. MITCHELL:there, yes. Then the smolt
26 line out migration passage, we've discussed this
27 quite a bit in the earlier agency meeting. But we

1 want to evaluate proven Alaskan designs for
2 downstream passage facilities for salmon smolt and
3 analyze adaption of these systems to Sweetheart Creek
4 put and take salmon fishery. I have had
5 consultations with the manager of the Deer Lake
6 Hatchery. He's analyzed our terrain and he -- you
7 know, and so we've not just done desk references, but
8 we've contacted the Spirit Lake folks, the Kodiak
9 Hatchery Association, and as well as NSRAA, which is
10 the Northern Southeast.....

11 MR. MILLER: Northern Southeastern Regional
12 Aquiculture Association.

13 MR. MITCHELL: Thank you. Thank you. And so,
14 we're doing our research at this point to make sure
15 that, you know, we know what we're talking about and
16 that we can try to adapt that. Obviously each piece
17 of terrain and each lake is different, they're not
18 exactly the same. But you can take templates and you
19 can take proven system and adapt them. And that's
20 what we're attempting to do.

21 Under terrestrial resources, under wildlife
22 study and surveys, we want to conduct wildlife
23 surveys. Wildlife related study plans will be
24 developed with input from Alaska state and federal
25 resource agencies. Like I said, I have put out the
26 study plan for our terrestrial, wildlife, and
27 botanical resources. And so we're looking for input

1 right -- currently, right now, for that study plan.
2 But we want to, one, assemble existing information on
3 distribution, abundance, seasonal habitat and
4 movement patterns of wildlife in project area. Two,
5 conduct aerial and ground surveys to determine
6 feasibility of conducting baseline surveys. Three,
7 general visual observations of birds, bird calling
8 and other forms of documentation. Four, bald eagle,
9 goshawk nest site survey in and around project
10 infrastructure locations. Quantify existing habitats
11 in project area. Evaluate effects of infrastructure
12 on wildlife, access to wildlife, distribution and
13 patterns of wildlife. And seven, evaluate effects on
14 migratory and shore birds.

15 Underneath, our botanical study, we want to --
16 it'll consist of baseline surveys for potentially
17 affected botanical resources, according to study
18 plans approved by the Forest Service, Alaska Fish and
19 Game and perhaps other agencies. Typically, baseline
20 plan surveys include, one, aerial inventories of
21 vegetative type, primarily from existing imagery.
22 Two, then foot surveys, to ground truth --
23 ground-truth the aerial inventories. And a
24 preliminary jurisdictional determination to determine
25 location, type, function and extent of wetlands,
26 uplands, and water of the US in the project area.
27 And prior to construction -- we've changed that, it

1 isn't just prior to construction, it's during the
2 study period. Juneau Hydropower will conduct
3 sensitive plant surveys according to Forest Service
4 prescriptions in potentially affected areas
5 delineated in the project final design.

6 MS. RODMAN: I know that the Forest Service has
7 provided comments on the Terrestrial Study Plan, and
8 I don't think you've had a chance to see them. And I
9 know I haven't. But I was wondering, are you going
10 to do any ground work on invasive plants?

11 MR. MITCHELL: It's already being done.

12 MS. RODMAN: Oh, okay.

13 MR. MITCHELL: We had -- that's why Mr. Comstock
14 was missing in action this morning.

15 MS. RODMAN: Oh, okay.

16 MR. MITCHELL: He was actually performing hard
17 core work rather than agency work, bringing folks
18 back from Gilbert Bay that had walked the
19 transmission line route and the lower portions of
20 Gilbert Bay where the dock and the road and the
21 powerhouse would be for exactly that purpose.

22 MS. RODMAN: All right.

23 MR. MITCHELL: Well, that and wetlands purposes.

24 MS. RODMAN: Okay. Wonderful.

25 MR. MITCHELL: Threatened and endangered
26 species, there is what they call -- and I don't want
27 to mix up the words because they're technical,

1 sensitive species? Or what was the word?

2 MS. RODMAN: The Forest Service has a
3 classification, which is sensitive species. And
4 that's not a term that's used in the Endangered
5 Species Act.

6 MR. MITCHELL: Right.

7 MS. RODMAN: So, it -- you know, as we had said,
8 I'd like to put sensitive species in terrestrial
9 resources so that nobody has any confusion about
10 whether the Commission needs to consult with either
11 Fish and Wildlife Services or the National Marine
12 Fisheries Service on a sensitive species. Now, it's
13 only listed threatened and endangered species.

14 MR. MITCHELL: Right. It's a legal breakpoint.

15 MS. RODMAN: Yeah.

16 MR. MITCHELL: And so, there is no threatened
17 and endangered species proposed at this time, because
18 we're not aware that there's any threatened or
19 endangered species in the project area or boundaries
20 or the area of potential effects.

21 Under recreation, you know you've heard some
22 things about what we're looking to do with mitigating
23 things. And sometimes those come later in the
24 process where people horse trade, we'll do this if
25 you let us do that. I think we've kind of put our
26 cards out on the table. We're trying to mitigate our
27 footprint, we're trying to lessen the impact on all

1 users, recreational as well as on the habitat.

2 And so, you know, we have to explore the impacts
3 of increased accessibility and how the alter
4 development character will have on recreational
5 opportunities. We all know, as you walk through the
6 woods, you tend to take a trail rather than blaze one
7 yourself. Same thing's going to hold true if we put
8 a road in. People are going to tend to walk the road
9 to the barrier falls or to the powerhouse area and
10 then to the barrier falls, as opposed to maybe
11 walking up the mud creek or dodging bears that are in
12 the creek.

13 So, these are some of the things we'll look at.
14 Recreational use survey analysis, you know, Juneau
15 Hydropower will use information obtained from guides
16 and outfitters in its socioeconomic survey to obtain
17 areas of concern for recreational users of Gilbert
18 Bay and Sweetheart Creek and impacts on boat
19 anchorage, impact in -- on dispersed recreation and
20 impacts on icing in Gilbert Bay. But I want to add
21 in, this morning, the Forest Service mentioned that,
22 you know, there's people that go out there for bear
23 viewing or for other forms of just boating and
24 anchoring, visiting, sight seeing. And we need to
25 figure out how to capture some of those folks in the
26 comment. And then there was the personal use
27 fishery. And I didn't hear very clearly, but do any

1 of you members from Fish and Game, will we, as the
2 applicant, have access to the names and folks that
3 use the personal use fishery to send them out
4 potential survey. And I don't really want to put you
5 on the spot, but is there even a possibility of a
6 collaborative send out where we develop the survey,
7 and maybe you send it or we pay the postage.

8 MR. FLUETSCH: We need a tape timeout before you
9 answer.

10 MR. MITCHELL: So, don't answer yet.

11 MR. FLUETSCH: I'm being considerate.

12 (Whispered conversation)

13 MR. MITCHELL: Okay.

14 MR. MILLER: This is Monte Miller, Fish and
15 Game. With regard to your question about
16 accessibility to that information, we would have to
17 check with the division that handles that as to what
18 records they have and what are available. What the
19 legal status is of releasing that. Generally, most
20 records such as permit drawings and things, you know,
21 in the past were available, but then they became
22 targeted by non-hunters or those types of things.
23 So, I would have to defer to what those agencies or
24 those departments or those divisions within Fish and
25 Game are currently doing, based on legal things that
26 are way above my head.

27 MR. MITCHELL: That's fair. I think from us, as

1 the -- as Juneau Hydropower, we're willing to go, you
2 know, and do the reasonable effort to send out a
3 survey or to do things to garner information back
4 from those people if we have access to that data.
5 It'll probably be unlikely that we will poll people
6 out there while they're fishing. One, if I'm going
7 out there to go cast netting, I want to spend my time
8 -- my day off putting nets in the water, not talking
9 to somebody who wants to take a survey. But -- I
10 don't even like taking phone surveys. So, I mean,
11 that's just me. But someone may. But I'm just
12 looking at the usefulness of getting good data, good
13 information back on the recreational users.

14 I guess where we're coming from is we are going
15 to do what we can do to capture -- we know we can get
16 the guides and outfitters. We're going to try to
17 track down some commercial fishers. And you know,
18 we'll do what we can with the personal use with the
19 information that we can obtain from contacting those
20 particular individuals. We want to be able to get a
21 broad sample -- go ahead, Cathy.

22 MS. NEEDHAM: This is Cathy Needham. One
23 suggestion maybe, with regards to that that just
24 occurred to me is, people have to go to get a permit
25 to do personal use fishery. And so, you may want to
26 just provide a survey for them at that time when they
27 pick up a permit. Maybe it can be right there where

1 they get their permit as, like, a volunteer survey
2 for people who are interesting in commenting back
3 that have to go get permits for the personal use.

4 MR. MITCHELL: And that might be something that
5 might be useful for Fish and Game, as well as us, so
6 that -- I'm just throwing -- tossing -- that's a good
7 idea to toss out to see if maybe that could be
8 percolated in Fish and Game, because that might be a
9 way of capturing some of that data.

10 MR. MILLER: Yeah, I am -- Monte Miller, Fish
11 and Game. I am not familiar with their procedure for
12 this particular personal use fishery. Other personal
13 use fisheries in Southcentral Alaska, a person does
14 pick up a personal use fishery application. But it's
15 also available from license vendors. So, I don't
16 know if that's the case in Southeastern. You may
17 have a bigger issue with trying to get those things
18 out.

19 MR. MITCHELL: You have to -- I know you have --
20 I got one. So, you have to physically.....

21 MR. MILLER: Do you have to go to Fish and Game
22 to get it?

23 MR. MITCHELL:go to the Douglas desk.

24 MR. MILLER: Okay. And in Anchorage, you can go
25 to Wal-Mart and get your personal use fishery permit
26 for those fisheries up there. So, if that's the
27 case, I want to believe that some of this stuff would

1 be covered under public information, at least as far
2 as a number of people, the harvest data, that,
3 because they are required to, as you know, required
4 to fill out the harvest card and submit it within,
5 what, 30 days of the close of the fishery?

6 MR. MITCHELL: Yeah, we -- you get a thing sent
7 out to you every year, how many days did you fish?
8 How many did you get?

9 MR. MILLER: So, this one is a little different
10 than the one up north.....

11 MR. MITCHELL: Yeah.

12 MR. MILLER:because that one, you have a
13 harvest card, you must keep the daily totals on the
14 back of the card.

15 MR. MITCHELL: And I'm sure that talking to the
16 right people at Fish and Game, they'll give us that
17 data, so I have raw numbers of how many fishers went
18 there this year versus last year.....

19 MR. MILLER: Whether or not.....

20 MR. MITCHELL:how many days they went,
21 what fish did they catch, what timing of the year.
22 But that doesn't go to the next level of.....

23 MR. MILLER: It's entirely possible that you
24 could coordinate a survey, either by getting names
25 and addresses or by paying for postage and whatever
26 format and coordinating with the biological people
27 who deal with that within Fish and Game.

1 MR. MITCHELL: Okay.

2 MR. MILLER: I think that that's entirely
3 possible. And I recognize that it would be an
4 excellent tool to get further input on the fishery,
5 you know, for management purposes.

6 MR. MITCHELL: So, that being said, if we're
7 willing to drive on for the public, we're willing to
8 drive on on that particular area, since that's
9 comment did come up earlier today. It came up from
10 some federal agencies, assuming that we can just get
11 access to Fish and Game records.

12 MR. MILLER: Even you find out with a federal
13 agencies, they have their database, but you can't
14 access it.

15 MR. MITCHELL: Right. So, under aesthetic
16 resources, you know, Juneau Hydropower will research
17 existing aesthetic resource information including
18 existing U.S. Forest Service plans to distinguish
19 aesthetic impacts in the various potentially affected
20 areas. Viewshed analysis may be required to evaluate
21 infrastructure improvements and their effects from
22 Port Snettisham and Gilbert Bay. All constructed
23 project features will be evaluated relative to U.S.
24 Forest Service and other stakeholder prescriptions
25 for maintenance of aesthetic values from various
26 viewing points to include soundscape and
27 illumination.

1 Juneau Hydropower will conduct computer
2 generated depictions of proposed infrastructure
3 seeking to mitigate visual impact of affected areas.
4 This issue derives primarily from concern for U.S.
5 Forest Service visual quality standards in project
6 boundary area. Visual effects of an overhead
7 transmission line would also be considered, depending
8 on the final design. And then, we would examine
9 noise effects during construction and operation, and
10 I'd probably include in there maintenance since that
11 was brought up today. And I think wherever you see
12 in our documents construction operation, we'll
13 include maintenance. Examine effects of installation
14 and maintenance of salmon out migration system on
15 scenery and aesthetic values.

16 The Deer Lake system, frankly, you can see it
17 snake down the creek bed. It's there. It's going to
18 impact -- if we put the out migration system, and
19 that's acceptable, it's going to create an aesthetic
20 issue. So, then it's a balance issue of what needs
21 to be taken into consideration.

22 Cultural resources, Juneau Hydropower intends to
23 inventory cultural resources in an Area of Potential
24 Effects (APE) to document the existence of cultural
25 resources within areas which might be affected by
26 project related construction, road building or other
27 ground disturbance.

1 These surveys will be in two stages. Stage 1
2 will be less intensive reconnaissance level surveys
3 designed to define the direct and indirect impact
4 area of the project and the potential of the areas
5 for containing sites -- cultural sites. Stage 2
6 surveys will be conducted in those areas identified
7 in the Stage 1 surveys as having a reasonable
8 likelihood of containing sites. The scope of all
9 surveys work will be determined in consultation with
10 the Alaska State Historic Preservation Office, the
11 Forest Service, and Native Alaskan Tribes, and other
12 stakeholders.

13 We've contacted the Douglas Indian Association.
14 The Douglas Indian Association is the traditional
15 tribal area -- or their people of the Douglas Indian
16 Association is the traditional area of this
17 particular Port Snettisham and the Gilbert Bay. And
18 that's based on the Goldschmid and Haas 1946 surveys
19 and records. We have contacted them to collaborate
20 with us with our cultural resources.

21 The potential studies, socioeconomic, explore
22 impacts of personal and commercial opportunities on
23 fish and wildlife harvested. Again, we will put in
24 there some continuation from this morning's with the
25 agencies and some discussion tonight with regards to
26 the personal use fishery in the socioeconomic as
27 opposed to in the cultural, which will be more

1 focused on traditional subsistence. J -- Juneau
2 Hydropower intends to interview and survey guides and
3 outfitters that take clients to project area to
4 register concerns, impacts and areas of potential
5 mitigation. Again, we will include others as we
6 develop this in the issues that we were just raising
7 earlier, maybe some personal use fishers and
8 fishermen.

9 And that pretty much wraps up our studies.
10 Again, our cultural study plan and our wildlife and
11 terrestrial, which includes botany and wetlands,
12 study plan is on the website. It's been on the
13 website for, I'm going to say months now. And that
14 gives a little more detail on what we're doing, what
15 we're looking at doing. Based on scoping doc --
16 scoping comments made today and submitted, we can
17 modify those to include some increases in the scope,
18 so to say, in those two areas. I've been working
19 with Fish and Game to issue out our fisheries, or
20 what I'll call aquatics, study plan. And I've broken
21 them down by geographical area, Sweetheart Lake,
22 Sweetheart Creek, and the marine areas so that we can
23 try to geographically encompass those issues.

24 So, those will coming out after the comment
25 period from the scoping document so that I'm able to
26 capture all of the aquatics information. That being
27 said, we're not waiting for agencies or public to

1 make comments before we can take the common sense
2 approach, I'll say, towards study plans. It's not
3 rocket science to see what other projects in
4 Southeast Alaska have been required to do. I've also
5 taken the liberty to talk to fisheries biologists,
6 which Fish and Game has been quite cooperative with
7 their personnel and their time of assisting us,
8 teaching us, helping us learn, and becoming more
9 acquainted with what the protocols are and how we
10 should go about studying certain species with the
11 resident experts.

12 The same goes for the botany and the invasive
13 plant folks from the U.S. Forest Service, as well as
14 from the U.S. Forest Service and from the State
15 Historical Preservation Office that we've contacted
16 and worked with on the cultural aspects. So, I guess
17 what I'm saying is our study plan development isn't
18 where we just throw it out there to get comments, but
19 it's actually quite collaborative up front to try to
20 get all the known issues, allow people to see them up
21 front.

22 And hopefully when the study plan comes out,
23 it's already a very good product that needs just may
24 -- that just needs fine tuning as it -- instead of
25 major revisions. Because frankly, I've gone to all
26 the agencies ahead of time to get their input up
27 front. And then that allows our contractors to

1 wisely use their time for the maximum effect to hit
2 the big rocks on the radar screen, so to say, of the
3 issues that need to be studied. And I feel that
4 that's more judicious and wise. It's also a good way
5 of using the alternative licensing process for what
6 it was used for -- or what it was intended for. And
7 then that way we can move methodically and
8 expeditiously along the time lines towards the
9 licensing process. So, that's our -- what do you
10 call, strategy or our methodology toward the study
11 process. And with that, I will open this up for any
12 additional audience comments and questions, if
13 anybody should have some. Go ahead, Mr. Young.

14 MR. YOUNG: My name is Dale Young, and I just
15 recently became aware of this project, so I certainly
16 don't understand it to detail that those of you who
17 have been involved in it are aware. But I'd just
18 like to voice my strong support for this project. A
19 little bit about my background might put my comments
20 into perspective. I'm a lifelong conservationist,
21 I'm a retired Fish and Game fish biologist. I've
22 participated in the personal use fishery at
23 Sweetheart Creek. I've been inside the Snettisham
24 Power Plant right in the turbine bays.

25 I believe that any project of this nature is
26 going to have a potential negative effect on fish and
27 wildlife resources. But it also can have a positive

1 effect. And these studies are going to show -- or
2 hopefully put into perspective the degree of the
3 positive versus the negative. But just in common
4 sense terms, if you look at the energy situation in
5 our country, I think the energy potential of this
6 project is going to far out weigh almost any fish and
7 wildlife concern, based on my knowledge of this
8 system. My knowledge isn't that great, but I have a
9 little bit of knowledge about it.

10 There are fish there that are used by sports
11 fishermen. Fish have to go through that area that
12 are used by commercial fishermen. Non-consumptive
13 uses of fish for -- just wildlife and conservation
14 are important. And certainly the bears and the
15 wildlife that use that area are just amazing for
16 anybody that's viewed them. But I believe that, with
17 a good design, this project can be put together in a
18 way that wildlife is not significantly damaged, more
19 than likely will be enhanced, and more than likely
20 more people will benefit from it. And in the long
21 term, I think that the energy benefits for a project
22 like this are just going to far outweigh any negative
23 aspects of the project.

24 I mean, you know, I'm looking at it very locally
25 from the project itself. I'm looking at it locally
26 from a Juneau resident perspective. But also as an
27 American citizen. And you know, the state of our

1 economy, the state of our energy resources, there's
2 probably projects like this all over the country that
3 have not been developed, just due to the significant
4 investment that's required to get through this
5 process. And I think what Juneau Hydropower is doing
6 is laudable. I mean, it's just -- it's amazing. So,
7 I just hope that you work with them and do everything
8 that you can within your particular perspectives to
9 assist them getting this permit. And the sooner, the
10 better for everybody.

11 MR. MITCHELL: Well, I have pretty much given my
12 FERC close -- my Juneau Hydropower closing comments
13 with my explanation at the end. So, at this time,
14 I'd like to turn over to Ms. Harper and her team for
15 any -- for words of wisdom or closing comments.

16 MS. HARPER: Well, thank you. And again, I'd
17 like to end the meeting the way we started it. I
18 want to thank each and every one of you for coming
19 out. This scoping is an incredibly important part of
20 our process. And so, hearing from you, getting your
21 perspective, your concerns, that's very valuable to
22 us. And so, thank you for giving us your evening,
23 your time. Information on this project can be found
24 on the website. And again, on the website are
25 helpful numbers. My contact information's in several
26 of these documents. Mr. Mitchell's contact
27 information is in several of these documents. So,

1 please stay involved, stay informed. And file any
2 comments you have. The official filing deadline for
3 comments on this is 30 days, which is October 7th.
4 But again, we want to hear from you. So, with that,
5 I'll let my colleagues -- if they have anything
6 they'd like to add. Okay. Well, again, on behalf of
7 all of here, thank you so much for coming out.

8 MR. MITCHELL: Thank you.

9 MR. SMITH: Thank you.

10 MR. MITCHELL: Thank you.

11 MR. FLUETSCH: We're clear.

12 (Off record)

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

TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Clyde E. Pasterski, hereby certify that the foregoing pages numbered 3 through 104 is a verbatim transcript of the Public Scoping meeting (Evening Scoping Meeting) held at the Juneau Centennial Hall, Hickel Room, Juneau, Alaska, transcribed by me from a copy of the electronic sound recording to the best of my knowledge and ability.

Date Clyde Pasterski
Transcriber

Document Content(s)

0907pmsweetheart.TXT.....1-1

32276.DOC.....2-99