

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
CASCADE CREEK HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT
P-12405-002
JUNE 18, 2009
Tides Inn Conference Room
307 North First Street
Petersburg, Alaska 99833
7:00 p.m.

TEAM COORDINATOR: David A. Turner

APPEARANCES: David A. Turner
FERC
888 First Street, NE
Washington, DC 20246
Chris Spens
Project Manager
Cascade Creek, LLC
3633 Alderwood Avenue
Bellingham, WA 98225
Matthew Cutlip
FERC
805 SW Broadway Avenue
Suite 550
Portland, OR 97205

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

Table of Contents

AL DWYER -25-
ERIC LEE -29/46-
CHRIS SAVAGE -33-
MARTHA SMITH -41-
HEIDI LEE -42-
KARIN MCCULLOUGH -43-
SUZANNE WEST -44-
MIKE STAINBROOK -47-
DUFF MITCHELL -44-
WARREN EDGLEY -49-
ALBEUT HOWARD -53-
MATTHEW BELL -57-

1 P R O C E E D I N G

2 MR. TURNER: Can everybody have a seat and we'll
3 get started here. Hey guys. We'll get started and hold
4 it down.

5 I want to welcome everybody to the scoping meeting
6 for Cascade Creek. I want to welcome everybody to the
7 Cascade Creek Scoping meeting My name is David Turner,
8 I'm with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
9 outside of DC. Also here with me from FERC is Matt
10 Cutlip, our fisheries biologist. And I'll let you
11 introduce yourself Chris.

12 MR. SPENS: Chris Spens, Project Manager for
13 Cascade Creek.

14 MR. TURNER: A couple of housekeeping items before
15 we get underway, give you an idea of the agenda, the
16 purpose of tonight. This proceeding is being recorded.
17 So after a brief presentation about the project
18 proposal and some of the changes that have occurred
19 since some of the earlier meetings about a year ago or
20 so ago, which Chris is going to run through. I'll run
21 through some of the issues that we've identified based
22 on the information that's been filed on the record with
23 input from Cascade Creek, LLC. And then we're going to
24 open it up to comments for those -- for your input.
25 We've decided that an Environmental Impact Statement is

1 probably going to be necessary for this project. So,
2 this is -- this meeting tonight is intended to serve as
3 our scoping meeting to make sure that we have the
4 issues identified that need to be looked at in that
5 Environmental Impact Statement. So your input is
6 important to us, we need to hear that. But it's going
7 to be very important -- we'll bring the podium up, put
8 a microphone on there. And since it's being
9 transcribed it's going to be important that you talk at
10 the podium. If you don't feel comfortable doing that
11 you may file written comments, and we'll take written
12 comments until July 20th, or if you also want to file
13 written comments in addition to your oral testimony
14 here, you're welcome to do that. But again, it's going
15 to be important that you come up to the podium and talk
16 into the mic.

17 Our meeting this morning was a little bit
18 difficult because of some of the interactions and the
19 space and the two little microphones we have. So to
20 make sure that we get your comments on the records for
21 consideration it's going to be important that you talk --
22 come up to the podium and talk into the mic.

23 Basically, as I said, tonight's Scoping Meeting is
24 to get your input on the issues. We've identified some
25 based on the record that's been filed. And we'll be

1 talking -- if everybody has it -- there's extra copies
2 of the Scoping Meeting -- scoping document 1 in the
3 back here. Also, just one more item, please sign in if
4 you haven't already, before you leave so we have
5 everyone's attendance as well as helping out the
6 transcriber of the notes to your names and there
7 spelling. And with that I guess I'll let Chris run
8 through his project proposal and some of the changes
9 that have occurred in that proposal over the past year
10 based on your input and your comments.

11 MR. SPENS: Okay. Good evening, when we last
12 presented to the Petersburg public it was September
13 2007 and at that time we had three projects that we
14 were bringing forward. Subsequently, we're only
15 focusing now on the Cascade Creek, Swan Lake project,
16 and we have substantially modified the project from the
17 first presentation. Originally we had proposed a
18 system of conduit and tunnel to bring water from Swan
19 Lake to a power house near the base of Cascade Creek,
20 and that also involved transmission lines and access
21 roads along the shoreline. Since that time, based on
22 the response that we've received from Petersburg
23 citizens and the agencies, we've modified the project
24 so that the power house has now been moved
25 approximately a quarter mile south of the mouth of

1 Cascade Creek. There will be no surface access to Swan
2 Lake, it will be entirely a tunnel project with a lake
3 siphon constructed close to the outlet of Swan Lake.
4 Similarly, we have two physical access alternatives,
5 one would be a road extension from the existing
6 Patterson Delta network to the site along the eastern
7 shore of Thomas Bay. The other would be a dock only
8 access with a wharf constructed immediately in front of
9 the power house instead of a road. And then also
10 related to those two access alternatives would be a
11 transmission line alternative that would be an
12 extension along the existing road network, across the
13 Patterson Delta and then along newly constructed road
14 to the power house site, if that's selected. And in
15 the alternative, crossing the Patterson Delta on the
16 existing road network to the state dock, and then
17 proceeding as a undersea cable to the power house site.
18 So that there wouldn't be any surface effect. These
19 modifications are intended to essentially place the
20 facilities for the project into the landscape with a
21 minimum amount of disturbance, the minimum amount of
22 visual presence or influence. Try to remove
23 construction noise and activity as far away from those
24 recreational features and amenities as we understand
25 them.

1 Presented before you is a general area schematic
2 showing the transmission connection to Petersburg.
3 This schematic shows that it would come ashore at Sandy
4 Beach, which has been made clear to me that that's a
5 recreational park, an area that includes some
6 historical artefacts and would not be a suitable
7 landing point. In the alternative, just to the north
8 of this area, there's an existing utilidor where
9 undersea cables come ashore that would be much more
10 suitable. But it's important when you look at general
11 schematic like this to know that there would be some
12 detail route finding as we get farther along in the
13 process. It takes the connection from Petersburg
14 underneath Frederick Sound over to the Patterson Delta,
15 comes ashore on a headland just north of Brown Cove,
16 traverses the Delta on an existing road network for the
17 most part that's located on Forest Service land. Then
18 comes to a junction where one alternative would
19 continue north to the existing dock and across Thomas
20 Bay and the other alternative would use the forestry
21 road network and run up along the eastern shore, and
22 then be extended as a new road from Delta Creek to the
23 site. Now the transmission on Petersburg side of
24 things would be essentially across the airport property
25 where there's an existing distribution line proposal.

1 This schematic shows the two transmission line
2 alternatives, undersea for Thomas Bay and the road
3 network.

4 This particular schematic shows what might be with
5 a dock access, which is that small little finger
6 sticking out in front of the power house at the very
7 top of the page. If the dock access alternative were
8 selected there would not be any road coming to the site
9 whatsoever. Otherwise there would be a road
10 essentially as shown. What's in red is either existing
11 road network or abandoned or unused previously
12 constructed road network. What's shown in black for
13 about a mile and a half would be a new road segment for
14 access.

15 This is the power house site plan. Again, about a
16 quarter mile south of the mouth of Cascade Creek, close
17 to the existing Forest Service cabin, which is right
18 here. This shows the road access coming from the
19 south. I might point out that at all times new road,
20 if it were constructed would be more than 200 feet from
21 the shoreline or from the ordinary high water mark.
22 This site plan shows the power house and the three
23 turbine system here. Around it shows an area that
24 would be filled with tunnel excavation material,
25 approximately 81,000 cubic yards of material. This

1 area topographically lays within a moderate depression
2 or a recess into the hillside, and therefore we believe
3 it would be suitable to receive this fill material.
4 The project would include a constructed tailrace, an
5 outfall; the outfall would cut through the 200 foot
6 setback zone and would be shaped and configured and
7 lined to look as natural as possible, meaning rock
8 line. There would be no other intrusion in the 200
9 foot shoreline area under this alternative except for
10 the tailrace. The tunnel coming through the mountain
11 would come out at an elevation of approximately 300
12 feet above sea level.

13 In this alternative, which provides for dock
14 access the proposal would involve a dock or a wharf of
15 approximately 150 feet in length by 20 feet in width.
16 It would include an access road from the dock to the
17 site. This schematic also shows the undersea cable
18 leaving the power house, entering Thomas Bay and being
19 laid underneath. There would be no access road in this
20 alternative. The site would essentially be isolated
21 and have only water access. Most of the other features
22 are the same. Approximately the same fill footprint
23 and features. The power house would be essentially
24 excavated or be placed lower than the current existing
25 grade and then earth material from the tunnel placed

1 and filled around it and constructed such that snow
2 slides, should they occur could run over the power
3 house.

4 Here's a cross sectional representation. Over in
5 this part of the schematic, lower left is Thomas Bay
6 and the ordinary high water mark and the shoreline,
7 where land meets the salt water. This is the existing
8 slope grade right here in grey. This represents where
9 the tunnel would come out at approximately 300 feet
10 elevation. The tunnel excavation material would be
11 discharged within the hill slope depressional area and
12 laid along all the way down to the power house. The
13 power house would therefore be set below current
14 existing grade and therefore would end up being
15 surrounded by earth materials, bunkered or bermed if
16 you will by a combination of the excavation activity
17 and the fill discharge around it. The area in between
18 the power house and the shoreline, the 200 foot buffer
19 would remain as it's existing condition, treed.

20 Moving now up to Swan Lake. This is a site plan
21 looking top down at what would be the intake site.
22 This is on the shore of Swan Lake near the west end,
23 very close to the outlet of the lake. You'll see in
24 subsequent pictures it lays on a delta or alluvial fan
25 combination. The facilities would include a gate house

1 or a valve house, an intake pipe extended into the lake
2 which would be laying across the ground and then go
3 down into the lake along it's embankment. It would
4 include, for the construction phase a helicopter
5 landing pad, a material lay down area for equipment and
6 supplies. It's total effected area here would be --
7 the whole thing up to three quarter of an acre
8 including some of the clearing setbacks.

9 This is a cross sectional view of the intake
10 structure. This represents the lake elevation, surface
11 elevation and where the lake meets the shore. This
12 would be a nine foot diameter pipe extended down into
13 the lake at a minimum depth of approximately 40 feet
14 and a maximum depth of approximately 60 feet. It would
15 include a screened intake for fisheries purposes and to
16 prevent any other material or debris from entering. It
17 would have about 40 feet of vertical separation to
18 avoid surface effects from the draw down or the siphon.
19 It would be constructed as a siphon such that, there
20 would be gate valve or shut off right here. The
21 operation would be started by evacuating air from the
22 pipe system, drawing water from the lake and filling
23 the pipe up to the valve, and as soon as the whole pipe
24 was full -- as soon as the whole pipe was full then the
25 valve would be open and water would begin to fill the

1 tunnel. The siphon's proposed as opposed to a lake
2 tap, which is a direct connection. A lake tap would be
3 a direct connection, such that the water can be shut
4 off, the tunnel could be dried out, it could be
5 inspected and in the case seismic event there would be
6 less likelihood of a break or a connection made
7 inadvertently or a disruption inadvertently. The gate
8 house would be constructed into the adjacent rock
9 slope, in part. It would partially covered or embanked
10 on the top. It would provide for slides to pass over
11 it, should they occur.

12 This is a side view, essentially from the lake
13 looking at what this site would be during the
14 construction period. It would involve a building
15 facade which could either be screened by vegetation or
16 architecturally modified (indiscernible), depending to
17 preference. It would include a large roll up access so
18 that machinery could access and remove and exchange
19 valves and piping if need be and a man door, helicopter
20 pad and a lay down area. And this is the pipe siphon
21 extending into the lake.

22 This is a cross sectional view of the tunnel, how
23 it would be constructed as we presently know it. In
24 the lower left is Thomas Bay and the power house, right
25 here. And the tunnel would exit the hill slope at an

1 elevation of approximately 300 feet and then be
2 connected to the power house by steel conduit. The
3 tunnel would extend into the hill approximately 1400
4 feet at a one percent grade, and then have a vertical
5 shaft going up slope approximately 1300 feet to the
6 next horizontal shaft, as well as extending straight
7 and exiting the top of the hill slope. The next
8 section of horizontal tunnel would be approximately
9 13,000 feet long and extend at a continuous grade of one
10 percent all the way to the siphon area. So the total
11 length of the tunnel would be approximately 15,000
12 feet. The tunnel would be constructed as an
13 approximately 12 foot diameter drill and shot tunnel,
14 as opposed to a tunnel boring machine. And then it
15 would be lined with steel pipe where necessary along
16 its sections and lined with steel pipe definitely where
17 it exits the mountain and comes to the power house and
18 likewise lined with steel pipe where it joins the lake
19 siphon.

20 This is a hydro graph composite of Cascade Creek
21 discharge. What this shows is a 38 year average
22 discharge over the months of the year -- the heavy dark
23 line. And it ranges from as little as perhaps 30 cfs
24 to maybe 580 or just shy of 600. The individual graphs
25 and colors represent individual year. And you can see

1 that there is some very extreme events upon occasion
2 and some very cold low flow frozen events as well.

3 This is a Google Earth top down view. This is
4 Swan Lake in this location right here. This is the
5 outlet of Swan Lake. This is the falls at Falls Lake
6 and Cascade Creek as it makes its way down and
7 discharges right here. This is the power house site
8 location approximately. This is roughly the area
9 beyond the outlet of Swan Lake that contributes to the
10 falls down below. The catchment area is approximately
11 like this. Which is to say there is a significant
12 catchment area beyond the area of Swan Lake that also
13 contributes runoff to the Cascade Creek Falls.

14 This is a water level view approaching the power
15 house site. The mouth of Cascade Creek is tucked in
16 behind this point -- thank you very much for that. The
17 power house site would be right here where you can see
18 it is the lowest place along the shoreline, the
19 flattest or gentlest slope if you will. It would be
20 located behind these trees. It would not be visually
21 apparent after constructed. This tree line right here
22 is about 700 feet in elevation. We checked that when
23 we took seaplane tours the other day. The tunnel would
24 exit the hill slope as its presently proposed, a little
25 less than half way up. And there would be a tear drop

1 shape of clearing during construction and the discharge
2 and fill. And then recover and revegetation.

3 In this picture -- this is kind of looking
4 northeast at the mouth of Cascade Creek. Spray Island
5 would be to the left off the picture. The Cascade
6 Creek power house would be entirely out of view. From
7 this perspective it would lay behind this small island.

8

9 This is the southern line or edge of activity of
10 the power house site. This is the existing Forest
11 Service cabin right here. This is the sandy beach,
12 this is a small stream discharge from a side drainage.
13 These trees here would all be in front of the power
14 house and the tailrace would come out, most likely tied
15 into this system.

16 This is looking almost straight on at the power
17 house site. It would be behind these trees right here.
18 The tailrace would discharge approximately here. The
19 dock, if it were selected would be placed in this
20 vicinity as well. The tunnel would exit the hillside
21 approximately half way up the hill.

22 This is looking mostly straight on but essentially
23 in encompasses the northern edge of the site. The
24 powerhouse would be located behind these trees, back in
25 here, dug down, bermed in.

1 And these are the two photos combined, powerhouse
2 behind these trees in this depressional area, with the
3 tunnel coming out approximately half way up the hill.

4 And this is looking northward of the site more
5 toward the mouth of Cascade Creek, Cascade Creek
6 proper.

7 This is an aerial view coming out of the Cascade
8 Creek canyon. The powerhouse site would be located
9 right in here, sitting behind the 200 foot wide setback
10 in the existing row of trees. The tunnel would come
11 out part way up the hill slope. The powerhouse site
12 right in here. This area is, in addition to being the
13 lowest in proximity also had the least reproduction
14 growth, timber wise.

15 Here's about as direct a view as it gets. This
16 would be the powerhouse site. It would be situated
17 between two drainages, this one right here and over
18 here. There does not appear to be any standing water
19 or drainages located on the site. The tunnel would
20 come out of the hill a little less than half way up the
21 hill. Looking head on if you were a boat or seaplane
22 landing after it was constructed the only thing you
23 would see, if the road access alternative was built
24 would be the tailrace coming out here. You might see
25 some signature of the road passing through the timber,

1 that's possible. If the dock alternative is selected
2 the only thing you would see would be the dock and the
3 tailrace and the access road cutting through the trees
4 and then turning forming a baffle. After it was
5 constructed and replanted over we believe it would look
6 very much the same as this, with the exception of a
7 dock and tailrace.

8 Up on Swan Lake, this is the general vicinity of
9 the intake area. This is a small alluvial, partially
10 fluvial fan. Intake structure would be located all the
11 way over on the west end or right side of the picture,
12 embanked in this hillside. This ridge up here is
13 approximately 400 feet higher than the lake. It's a
14 rock ridge that extends as a sub-arm and as such it
15 doesn't collect a lot of snow. It has matured
16 treescape on its face and appears to be geologically
17 stable, whereas directly inline and heading up slope
18 there's quite a bit of snow accumulation. And when we
19 flew over the lake on Wednesday there were some very
20 dramatic snow slides that came right down through the
21 center of this zone but didn't effect either flank
22 whatsoever.

23 This picture shows the relatively low elevation
24 arm on top, the approximate area of the intake and the
25 notion that it would be embanked into the hillside,

1 essentially protected by this rock arm.

2 This is looking head on approximately where the
3 intake structure would be located, back into this rock
4 face.

5 This is a front on view of the whole delta. What
6 I saw Wednesday is this shoot came continuously down
7 through and sized this delta quite substantially
8 creating, at least for this season a single channel.

9 Another perspective.

10 This is the existing Forest Service cabin on Swan
11 Lake. This is at the east end of the lake. We propose
12 no facilities in this vicinity whatsoever, but rather
13 just show it as the primary recreational feature or
14 place where people stay. In addition to the second
15 largest input stream that we find coming into the lake
16 that may have some fisheries utilization.

17 This is Upper Cascade Creek above Swan Lake as it
18 comes into Swan Lake near the bottom of the picture.
19 And again from the seaplane on Wednesday there were
20 numerous sites, little avalanches and debris slides
21 cutting into and across this -- a very dramatic change
22 actually from these pictures.

23 This is the mouth of Cascade Creek entering Swan
24 Lake as it looked last July. And it shows it has a
25 braided channel system entering. It has a different

1 form depending on what the lake level elevation is.
2 And it leaves a terrace signature along the delta that
3 shows the lake level does fluctuate fairly
4 significantly naturally.

5 This is a small pond or off alignment catchment
6 downstream of Swan Lake but above Falls Lake falls.
7 This area may contain fish.

8 This is the outlet of Swan Lake, well to the west
9 of where our intake structure would be. Our intake
10 structure as proposed would be far off to the left of
11 this picture.

12 This is what it looks like as you approach the
13 outlet.

14 This is the outlet, per say. And part of our
15 proposal involves placing a sill or seal, such that
16 water wouldn't leak out through the boulders below the
17 normal ordinary high water mark. The water would be
18 contained and released as necessary, either to provide
19 low flows or for ascetic reasons, as the case may be.
20 But we do propose a modification, such that depending
21 on the depth of the boulder field here we would
22 establish a near leak proof barrier. Whether that's a
23 sill or grouting between the rock or some other
24 structure. It is part of the proposal, but upon
25 completion it would be our intent that it remain

1 natural looking.

2 And this is downstream of the outlet heading
3 towards Falls Lake.

4 Those would be pictures and schematics of the
5 project as we know it today. Shaped substantially by
6 your input since September '07. That will be all I
7 have for right now.

8 MR. TURNER: Okay. I'm going to briefly run
9 through the issues we've identified based on the record
10 so far. As I said it's -- I'm not going to read them
11 verbatim, but if you want to follow along there's a
12 copy of the Scoping Document in the back. Beginning on
13 about page 10 of the Scoping Document, that's where we
14 start talking about cumulative affects. The record so
15 far suggests that there's only one resource area that
16 may be cumulatively affected. And what we mean by
17 cumulative affects are those actions that may be
18 occurring in conjunction or separate from this action,
19 such as float planes or timber cuts, or whatever else
20 may be there. Residential developments that may occur
21 in the vicinity that may have a synergistic affect or
22 add on -- an additive affect on the resources that this
23 project may also affect. That analysis is going to
24 look pretty much in the Thomas Bay area and over a
25 period of 30 to 50 years because the Commission issues

1 licenses for hydroelectric projects for a period of 30
2 to 50 years.

3 With regard to site specific resource issues that
4 are basically related to the direct and indirect
5 affects of the project. We're going to be looking a
6 geology and soils, as when anytime you have such major
7 activities there's going to be soil disturbance and
8 associated with that are potentials for soil erosion,
9 encounter of seeps and other ground water that could
10 create erosion. We're going to look at those effects
11 and the effects on the water quality and the resources.
12 What effects the fluctuation levels that Chris was
13 talking about, or up to a 10 foot fluctuation zone that
14 Swan Lake may have on shoreline stability. And we're
15 going to also look at the spoils -- disposals from the
16 creation from the tunneling of the penstock.

17 With regard to water quality and water quality,
18 we'll look at how those construction effects as
19 operations may be effecting sediment, sediment
20 turbidity. The presence of construction equipment and
21 what kind of measures are necessary to prevent any kind
22 of fuel, lubricant or other kinds of waste from
23 escaping and having adverse effects on the environment.

24 We will be looking at some of the changes that are
25 potentially -- that potentially occur associated with

1 dissolved oxygen, total dissolved gas, lake flushing
2 associated with Falls Creek, Cascade Creek. We'll also
3 be looking at the effects on the fisheries associated
4 with Swan Lake. The water fluctuations on the
5 shoreline habitats and aquatic and near shoreline
6 habitats with regards to the fisheries. As well as any
7 construction related effects associated with the
8 resources in Thomas Bay.

9 We'll also be looking at, from the terrestrial
10 resources perspective the changes in habitats, their
11 disturbance on wildlife. And those disturbances that
12 may be associated with all the construction activities,
13 noise, blasting, increased human presence from the
14 various different types of access associated with the
15 dock. The roads that may be constructed. We'll be
16 looking at transmission lines and the substations and
17 how they may be or may not be a hazard to raptors;
18 electrocution and collision to raptors and what kind of
19 measures may be necessary to mitigate those effects.

20 At the time that we wrote this we did not -- we
21 were not aware of any listed species that may be in the
22 area. However, it has come to our attention that with
23 the dock alternative there may be some marine mammals
24 were going to have to look at. So, they'll be a change
25 our document to reflect that.

1 One of the biggest issues is going to be
2 recreation. As we see it, recreation and land use
3 changes and how this project may be influencing both
4 recreation and aesthetics, and the activities that are
5 going on there. Who they're going to be effecting
6 those resources. How those actions may be affecting
7 the use of the Forest Service cabin up on Swan Lake as
8 well as down on Thomas Bay. How the project may be
9 affecting the aesthetic values of both Thomas Bay as
10 well as at the Swan Lake. They will be cultural
11 resources, we have a responsibility there under the
12 National Historical Preservation Act to consider what
13 effects we may be having on cultural resources. And
14 we'll be looking at the socioeconomic affects of
15 project construction and operation not only from the
16 perspective of how the construction workforce maybe
17 imposing on the existing infrastructure of Petersburg
18 and the area, what kind of jobs it may bring, but also
19 what kind of effects it might be having on -- the
20 project may be having on the uses of Thomas Bay.

21 Developmental resources is something sort of
22 unique to the Federal Power Act that the Commission
23 must consider. When we consider our actions we try --
24 we have an obligation to balance the developmental or
25 the energy values of the project against the

1 environmental values or non-developmental values. And
2 the developmental resources will look at what the --
3 what kind of economics the projects -- what kind of
4 economical the project -- we'll be looking at the
5 project economics in terms of the generation it
6 produces as well as the cost of the various mitigation
7 measures that are being put in place to deal with the
8 issues.

9 On page 14 through 16 or 15 are a number of
10 mitigation measures. I'm not going to run through
11 those. I think Chris has pretty much hinted at a lot
12 of the specifics that have been associated or that the
13 changes that they have done to try to accommodate some
14 of the issues that have been raised at previous
15 meetings including reducing the fluctuation zone from
16 45 feet to a 10 foot level fluctuation. The proposed
17 soil and erosion control plans to be developed as well
18 as spill prevention controls, and revegetate and
19 disturbed areas and developing noxious weed control
20 plan, and et cetera.

21 So rather than run through that that you can all
22 read for yourselves, I'm just going to leave that
23 unless somebody wants to raise that. With that I want
24 to turn it over to you so that we can hear from you
25 whether or not there is any issues that have been

1 outlined in the Scoping Document that we've missed,
2 whether we've mis-characterized something in there.
3 Maybe something we've identified isn't an issue. We'd
4 like to hear that as well. So, with that I'd like to
5 open it up and again remind you that you're going to
6 need to come up to the podium so we make sure that we
7 get this on the record. So, you want to start us off?
8 And please state your name and any affiliation you may
9 have.

10 AL DWYER

11 statement as follows:

12 My name is Al Dwyer, I'm Mayor of Petersburg. And
13 before I start I want to apologize, because some of you
14 heard this this morning, or a draft of it. This is the
15 final document that we submit.

16 In preparing these brief comments, Petersburg has
17 carefully reviewed the pre-application documents issued
18 in June 2007 and the draft field season study plan
19 issued on August '08, not filed with FERC, and the
20 Environmental Impact Statement Scoping Document issued
21 May '09. We find discrepancies and significant
22 omissions that should be addressed in the environmental
23 and socioeconomic impact studies -- I've got a cold
24 coming here -- to support and application for the FERC
25 license. We will provide more detailed written

1 comments by July 20th, '09.

2 We request that a response to these comments be
3 filed with FERC and made a part of the public record.
4 We also request that copies of all project documents be
5 provided to the Petersburg Public Library for public
6 review. Including agency documents not filed with
7 FERC.

8 Consider the relationship of this project to the
9 proposed Ruth Lake and Scenery Lake hydro projects.
10 Consider the relationship of this project to potential
11 future land owners in Thomas Bay subdivision, Alaska
12 State Land Survey number 81-235. Power delivered to
13 SEAPA substation for transfer to potential purchases
14 would flow onto the SEAPA grid. We request that
15 Cascade Creek perform system analysis to identify
16 potential effects on SEAPA's system. How will Cascade
17 Creek insure that the addition of significant megawatt
18 hours will not cause reliability and frequency problems
19 on the SEAPA's systems.

20 Will Cascade Creek be offering firm or
21 interruptible power sales agreement to Southeast Alaska
22 power utilities? If firm, will Cascade Creek provide
23 backup for any power sold to Southeast Alaska utilities
24 in event of an outage on the transmission line or the
25 project. If firm, who will Cascade Creek contract with

1 and at what price to provide backup in event of such
2 outages? Will Cascade Creek accept rate regulation by
3 the Regulatory Commission of Alaska? What is the
4 current status of Cascade Creek's consultation and
5 negotiations with SEAPA and it's members? How will
6 Cascade Creek insure that no harm results to SEAPA's
7 system with the addition of power flowing on SEAPA's
8 transmission system? Will Cascade Creek pay SEAPA to
9 upgrade it's grid to accommodate the additional load?
10 Excuse me. Please provide a signed copy of the Power
11 Sales Agreement with Wrangell for future delivery of
12 power. Wrangell assembly members have reported it will
13 cost 6.8 cents per kilowatt hour. Is this true? Will
14 Cascade Creek enter into a Power Sales Agreement with
15 Petersburg Municipal Power & Light for standby
16 generation when power is not available from SEAPA?
17 Will Cascade Creek pay Petersburg Power & Light for
18 added cost of diesel generation when upgrade work is in
19 progress on the SEAPA transmission system? Please
20 provide a copy of correspondence and any contract with
21 the Inside Passage Electrical Cooperative, that's IPEC
22 to sell power from Cascade Creek project to IPEC for
23 sale at Kake. Please provide correspondence and any
24 contract to transmit power to Kake across the Kake
25 Petersburg intertie. Reference has been made to

1 providing payment to Angoon from the sale of Thomas Bay
2 project generated power. Please provide a copy of
3 correspondence of any agreement with the City of
4 Angoon. Will Cascade Creek pledge money from project
5 sales to the extension of the southeast intertie from
6 Petersburg to Kake, Angoon, Hoonah and Juneau? What
7 consultations have you made with land owners for
8 upgrading and maintaining roads in the vicinity of the
9 project? Local recreation outfitters provide services
10 to clientele for trips to Thomas Bay and excursions on
11 land in the vicinity of the project. These issues were
12 raised during the September '07 meetings -- excuse me --
13 - in Juneau and Petersburg. Please prepare an economic
14 impact analysis of the potential loss or revenue by
15 local recreational outfitters and any proposal to
16 mitigate loss of revenue due to dislocation associated
17 with the construction and operation of the proposed
18 project. We note reference to potential additional
19 cabins in the area of the project. There was local
20 interest in recreational trails as well. We are
21 pleased that you were willing to accept conditions that
22 the U.S. Forest Service may request as to these
23 recreational uses. Please provide specifics regarding
24 boat docking, airplane access and road construction at
25 Thomas Bay. Please show these proposed project

1 facilities on a map with identification of local land
2 owners and how Cascade Creek proposes to acquire access
3 to any affected lands. Please be more specific than
4 your response at the September '07 meeting in
5 Petersburg that will use eminent domain under the
6 Federal Power Act. The land owners are likely to
7 request retail electrical service in exchange for
8 easements. Please provide a full disclosure of the
9 proposed jobs to be created by the project. The study
10 and construction schedules including the project --
11 projected demand on housing and local government
12 services. Is your proposed transmission line alignment
13 from Sandy Beach to Scow Bay consistent with the local
14 land use plan? Is there an alternate alignment?
15 Please provide full disclosure regarding how Cascade
16 Creek will manage hazardous waste on the site, solid
17 waste and sewage, spoils disposal and fuel supply.
18 Please provide full disclosure of the need for use of
19 local transportation facilities during construction.
20 Thank you for allowing me this minute.

21 MR. TURNER: Anyone else want to make any
22 statements? Sure.

23 ERIC LEE
24 statement as follows:

25 My name is Eric Lee, I just represent myself. I'd

1 like to take a look at some of the implications of
2 privatization of a public resource, which is what we're
3 talking about here. Right now we, the public who own
4 the water rights and the right to develop those water
5 resources into electric power for the good of all, in
6 perpetuity are being asked to give away those right to
7 a select few private individuals. If we were to give
8 away those rights to -- at Swan Lake we would lose
9 ownership and we would also lose control over
10 electrical rates. It's a fact that the price of
11 electricity generated from private sources is almost
12 always higher than electricity generated from public
13 sources. This is especially true in a case like Swan
14 Lake where the power generated there can be sold at a
15 premium price into the North American grid. This is
16 because clean renewable energy is worth a lot more on
17 the market than energy from dirty sources like coal
18 power plants or nuclear. It is also worth more because
19 it constant clean energy. Wind energy, solar, tidal
20 they are not constant and so on the market they do not
21 gain -- get nearly the price of clean, renewable power
22 which is the premium power that's available. So we've
23 got a big source of extremely valuable energy there at
24 Swan Lake and we are contemplating giving it away. If
25 we did give that right away, there would be no getting

1 it back. We would lose the control we now have over
2 our electrical rates as well. And this project would
3 likely be developed until it was ripe to sell. And
4 some big energy conglomerate like General Electric
5 would buy it, and then we'd be at a huge disadvantage.
6 Because we would have to deal with attorneys and
7 lobbyists of a company of that mag -- size. We would
8 be at a complete disadvantage. We'd be vulnerable to
9 whatever tactics they came up with or whatever policies
10 they wanted to implement. The utilities industry is a
11 huge industry. It's been around a long time, they've
12 had decades to develop strategies to deal with the
13 public and the politicians that the public has elected.
14 Our public officials who now really only have the
15 public interest at heart would then be vulnerable to
16 industry attorneys and lobbyists, and these are the
17 best of the best out there. Very sharp people. Our
18 politicians who now serve only the public would be
19 forced to consider the needs of a big outside utility
20 company and would be of course be attempted to cater to
21 the utility company because of campaign contributions
22 and other benefits that would be offered them. So it
23 could be a maras, that we would be a total disadvantage
24 to be involved in. There's no one that I know of in
25 Southeast Alaska that could deal with the attorneys and

1 lobbyists of a big utility corporation. So -- and also
2 another point is that utility company has for -- a
3 utility company has foreign investors, say for example
4 Canadian. They could claim investor disadvantage under
5 NAFTA, North American Free Trade Agreement. Investors
6 rights can be used as justification to maximize
7 profits, or in this case jack up the price of
8 electricity. And we should remember that the
9 electricity will be worth a premium price as it goes
10 into the Canadian power grid. So they will be a great
11 pressure to get the intertie built and ship the power
12 out. Under NAFTA the principle of investors rights to
13 maximize profits could be used to justify charging
14 higher rates for electricity.

15 Another thing is that the power that goes up AK/BC
16 intertie would greatly enable the development of the
17 huge mineral deposits near the headwaters of the
18 Stikine. If those deposits are developed the Stikine
19 salmon runs, we depend on would be subject to heavy
20 metal contamination and acid leaching. Could be that
21 over a few short decades the salmon runs could dry up
22 to nothing, as has happened in many other places. So
23 we need to protect our salmon runs on the Stikine and
24 not enable their demise.

25 There's another point here I was going to make,

1 let me just look at my list. Yeah, the point is that
2 utility companies are bought and sold. Projects like
3 this could be developed to a certain point and sold to
4 the highest bidder when it was ripe to do so. And then
5 in turn it could be sold again. So each time the
6 public loses control over what -- how much say they
7 have in control over electric rates and other aspects
8 of the project. So I wanted that to be included as
9 well. I think that the power lines have to be included
10 in the EIS as well. The intertie, it's all part of the
11 socioeconomic impacts of this project. I think the
12 power lines, since the power is distend to be exported
13 is just really as integral to the project as the
14 powerhouse or the lake itself. And therefore, a
15 complete analysis of the socioeconomic impacts of the
16 intertie and -- should be included in the EIS. Thank
17 you.

18 This is especially true at Swan Lake. I think the
19 power lines have to be included in the EIS also.

20 CHRIS SAVAGE

21 statement as follows:

22 Good evening, I'm Chris Savage, I'm the District
23 Ranger of the Petersburg Ranger District for the
24 Tongass National Forest. Thank you for the opportunity
25 to comment to Scoping Document 1 for the Cascade Creek

1 Hydropower proposal.

2 We will be submitting written comments that will
3 include more details on the concerns I am raising this
4 evening. The Forest Service will continue to work
5 collaboratively to provide background resource
6 information and to identify additional study needs, to
7 identify potential issues and to develop measures for
8 the protection, mitigation and enhancement for these
9 resources.

10 Our letter dated on December 12th, 2007 commented
11 on the Pre-Application Document, or the PAD. In that
12 letter we raised many questions about how the proposed
13 project may affect resources. Most of these questions
14 will fall under the issues headings listed in Scoping
15 Document 1. Recreation, socioeconomics, cultural
16 resources, hydrologic flows, and the scenic quality of
17 the area are the most important resources -- the most
18 important resource issues for the Forest Service.
19 Impacts to fisheries and wildlife populations are a
20 concern as well, however, we will defer to Alaska
21 Department of Fish and Game to make those calls and
22 will make sure our concerns are consistent with theirs.

23

24 The one major omission we see in Scoping Document
25 1 is the lack of proposed studies on the current and

1 future recreational uses and those uses on the related
2 socioeconomics from recreational activities.
3 Additional information on current uses and future
4 trends in both commercial and noncommercial recreation
5 use is needed to analyze effects of this project and to
6 design appropriate protection, mitigation and
7 enhancement measures. The Petersburg Ranger District
8 can provide some current and past recreational use that
9 occurs within and adjacent to Thomas Bay to help
10 Cascade Creek, LLC facilitate these studies. We
11 request that these studies need to be conducted before
12 Cascade Creek, LLC submits the Preliminary Draft EA to
13 FERC.

14 The Forest Service does like to see two
15 alternatives proposed in how to access the power house.
16 We currently do not have a preferred alternative
17 between the two options. Which ever alternative is
18 chosen, we expect that will be the common
19 transportation utility corridor for the area. All
20 subsequent development will follow the same route and
21 use the same infrastructure on what comes out of this
22 direction. The Forest Service is not interested in
23 designing or designating multiple transportation
24 utility corridors across National Forest system lands.

25 The Forest Service appreciates Cascade Creek, LLC

1 for addressing some of our initial concerns in our
2 December 12th, 2007 letter. Primarily by minimizing
3 the draw down levels on Swan Lake to ten feet rather
4 from the 40 plus feet as well as moving the power house
5 away from the mouth of Cascade Creek.

6 Again, thank you for the opportunity to comment
7 and expect to see more detailed comments in our
8 writing.

9 MR. TURNER: Would anybody else like to make a
10 statement?

11 MR. WOOD: My name is Ed Wood, I'm representing
12 myself. I just have a few questions is all. I'm a
13 little bit confused about this 10 foot draw down. I'm
14 not quite sure where that comes -- it looks like
15 there's a natural fluxuation in the lake. Are you
16 going to take the 10 foot draw down from the high water
17 mark, the normal water mark, or the low water mark. In
18 other words is it going to be 20 feet down? I don't
19 understand this, it's not clear.

20 MR. TURNER: We can take that and let Chris respond
21 to it.

22 MR. SPENS: What we observe at present is the lake
23 naturally fluxuates at least six feet. And our
24 operational desire would be to expand that somewhat.
25 And the example would be if the ordinary high water

1 elevation was 1520 feet, and the natural fluxuation
2 brought it down to 1514, or six feet lower. Then we
3 would like to study and explore the possibility of
4 operating such that we might draw it down an additional
5 two feet to 1512, or conversely we might store water an
6 additional two feet above it's present ordinary high
7 water of 1520, which would make it 1522. So if it
8 ranges six feet we would propose to add two feet of
9 storage on top and we consider to draw down an
10 additional two feet below its natural low water.

11 MR. WOOD: So you're going to go above flood stage
12 then, this that what you're saying then for raising it
13 up?

14 MR. SPENS: Above the ordinary high water mark. It
15 does surcharge from time to time. But for the most
16 part it has a somewhat stable elevation that exists
17 more often than other lake stages and that appears to
18 be around 1520.

19 MR. WOOD: Okay. Then the sill you're putting in,
20 is that going to dry up Cascade Creek outlet?

21 MR. SPENS: No. We would anticipate for a variety
22 of reasons that there would be the need to release flow
23 or provide low flow support for ecological purposes,
24 creatures, as well as for aesthetic purposes quite
25 possibility. So the -- the sill is intent to minimize

1 water loss. It would include a device or mechanism to
2 provide for flow release, especially at the lowest
3 anticipated lake elevation.

4 MR. WOODS: I see the top of the pipe underwater is
5 like 36 feet down from -- what's to keep you guys from
6 drawing on down? I mean who's going to monitor the
7 level? FERC's going to be long gone. Who's to say it
8 won't go down more than you're telling us?

9 MR. SPENS: Those are legal conditions established
10 by the permit for the operation if it's approved. So
11 the FERC license would stipulate the operating
12 elevations and the periods it might need to be certain
13 elevations throughout the year. And it would be
14 monitored by continuous lake stage gauges as well as
15 maintaining discharge records through the powerhouse.

16 MR. TURNER: And just to follow up, Chris is
17 absolutely right. We typically require operations
18 compliance monitoring plans be developed and that's the
19 way the Commission actually -- though we're not here
20 everyday, we will be able to check on the record and
21 make sure those things are being maintained and
22 operating in accordance with any license that may be
23 issued.

24 MR. WOOD: Okay. Okay. I'm a little bit curious
25 about this restocking the trout situation there. I

1 thought there were going to be screens on the intake
2 that you wouldn't be grinding them up in the turbines.
3 If you go to restock this lake what's to -- where are
4 you getting the trout from? I don't know, I hear from
5 various sources that there's a hatchery in Anchorage
6 for instance has this whirling disease. And that's
7 just about the last thing that we need around here is
8 to introduce something like that into this lake. So, I
9 don't know what -- you shouldn't have to go bring
10 Rainbow Trout in from somewhere else when in theory
11 they're already supposed to be there, they're supposed
12 to be kept there. They're not suppose to go through
13 the tubes, so that's just a thought

14 MR. SPENS: In that regard for the general
15 information of everyone. We're open to and would be
16 interested in providing enhancement, and if that
17 included stocking you know, if so, then so. It's not
18 our call, it's not our decision. We just want the
19 message that we'd be open to that as a mitigation
20 enhancement condition. It's really up to you local
21 community and your local agencies to decide how they
22 want to manage that resource. We're simply extending
23 our cooperative intent to do whatever might be deemed
24 useful.

25 MR. WOOD: Well it's really appreciatitive but

1 there should be plenty of trout as it is there now,
2 there always has been. Okay. One other thing, the map
3 shows that your proposed transmission line hook up on
4 figure 2 from Point Agassi in Petersburg and not across
5 the Frederick Sound to 12 Mile Creek is -- you proposed
6 in your Ruth Lake permit application. Have you given
7 up on the northern route to Kake?

8 MR. SPENS: For a period of time there was some
9 discussion of a northern intertie to Kake running up
10 along the east side of Kuperanof Island. And if that
11 came to pass as a transmission segment that was to be
12 constructed, you know that's worthy of possible
13 consideration. Our project for Cascade Creek/Swan Lake
14 right now proposes exactly as included in the Scoping
15 Document, which is from a headland just north of the
16 mouth of the Muddy River, north of Brown Cove and a
17 probable takeoff point.

18 MR. WOOD: I see that on your thing here.

19 MR. SPENS: Yeah.

20 MR. WOOD: And I guess about the last thing I have
21 here is on number 4.3.9, socioeconomics; no proposed
22 measures. The Alaska delegates to our Constitutional
23 Convention wanted the States resources developed and
24 not plundered. At the time of the Convention a current
25 opinion in Alaska was that corporate development such

1 as the Kinnicott Copper Mine made insufficient lasting
2 social and economic contributions to the territory.
3 Are we to expect that you would have us revert back to
4 pre Constitutional Convention days, I mean surely
5 there's some way if we're going to give this all up --
6 which I consider giving it up, it's taking away from
7 what we have now. If we're to give this up, what are
8 we going to get in return? That's a question that I
9 have. So, anyway I'm in favor of hydropower, green
10 power like this. I'm against this just because the use
11 it already has, it's as far as I'm concerned that lake
12 and the bay is pretty much fully utilized now. So, to
13 develop this I don't believe is going to help
14 Petersburg, so..... And I also would suggest -- this
15 is the beginning of the fishing season and this
16 community depends heavily on fishing. So guys are out
17 of town now probably until mid August, but your
18 timeframe for written comments is closed. I'd say the
19 timing really sucks on this. I'm not going to have
20 time for written comment, that's why I'm standing up
21 here tonight. So, that's about all I have, thank you.

22 MR. TURNER: Anybody else?

23 MARTHA SMITH

24 statement as follows:

25 I'm Martha Smith, I'm a Petersburg residence. And

1 I would first like to say that my very top preference
2 is no development, zero development at Thomas Bay.
3 It's highest value is to leave it alone. It's perfect
4 the way that it is, it doesn't need to be developed,
5 If this option does not exist then my second
6 choice would be publically owned and operated small
7 scale generating facility. We don't need a mega power
8 project that sells electricity to the lower 48. We
9 don't need that. It's not a fair exchange. And if
10 that alternative is not possible, then I will say that
11 this company has a bad repruption already in Alaska
12 and I would remind you of that fact. Thank you.

13 MR. TURNER: Anybody else like to say anything?

14 Ms. LEE: Oh yeah. I'd love to comment.

15 HEIDI LEE

16 statement as follows:

17 My name's Heidi Lee and I was born and raised
18 here. Families used this area for fishing and
19 recreation, many years have really enjoyed going over
20 the Cascade Creek and using the cabin. When you come
21 into that bay and you go up to that cabin you remember
22 -- you know, you remember why you love to live here and
23 the same with Swan Lake, if you can get up there and
24 you're lucky enough to be there you just know you're in
25 a very special, special place. And it would be like

1 giving the family heirloom and that's kind of what
2 you're -- we're having these people come in there and
3 they've been talking about it for a few years. Just
4 come on in, they're going to take over and they're
5 going to do all these great thing for their own
6 company. And we are going to be just sitting here
7 watching them do these things. It's just -- every time
8 I hear these guys talk they're divisive, they divide
9 our towns, Wrangell and Petersburg. They're nasty on
10 the phone. We don't want them and we don't need them.
11 Thank you.

12 MR. SPENS: For the record, I don't believe we've
13 ever spoken.

14 MS. LEE: There he goes. You should see him in
15 action.

16 MR. TURNER: Any other comments?

17 KARIN McCOLLOUGH

18 statement as follows:

19 My name's Karin McCollough, I live here in
20 Petersburg. Thank you very much for coming and
21 listening. In 2007 at the last meeting that we had I
22 said that I did not favor any development at all in --
23 of Swan Lake. And I still hold that opinion. When it
24 comes to looking at an EIS I'd like to see a lot more
25 attention put to what is the value of the solitude and

1 quite factor in that particular small baylet or inlet
2 to the right there as you come in. And what -- to
3 quantify that also in terms of everything else.
4 Because I feel that one of the highest things, one of
5 the highest amenities being lost, as many have said
6 here is solitude, quiet, non-developed area, and that's
7 not something we have a lot of. Even though there's
8 acres, and acres, and acres of it perhaps in Alaska, if
9 you go worldwide, and I'm looking on a worldwide stage
10 or United States wide, it's rare. So I would like to
11 see that looked at much, much more and over a longer
12 period of time in terms of an EIS study. We think in
13 terms of -- this is being proposed because of -- I
14 believe, because of the concentration of people in
15 other areas that need electricity. The concentration
16 of people also need the other things that Alaska has to
17 offer, and one of these is a place to come where there
18 is not noise, where there's not development, where they
19 can find solitude. Thank you.

20 MR. TURNER: Anyone else? This is your time.
21 Sure.

22 SUZANNE WEST
23 statement as follows:

24 My name is Suzanne West and I'm a local Petersburg
25 resident. And I was able to attend the 2007 meeting.

1 And we were promised verbatim minutes and there were
2 two attempts to issue those minutes and we've never
3 received them. So, those covered passionate comments
4 from all walks of life here in Petersburg from
5 professional, Fish and Game, Forest Service, charter
6 operators and there were probably upwards of 40 people
7 that couldn't be here tonight because they are out
8 fishing. We came back from fishing to be here. So, I
9 would recommend those minutes be transcribed, they were
10 done on video. And I had the opportunity last year to
11 fly up to Swan Lake and Forest Service has done an
12 exceptional job, a small footprint on an exceptionally
13 beautiful environment that everyone that has gone there
14 has left as serene and clean and untouched as when they
15 visited. And I am totally against the Thomas Bay
16 project by Cascade Creek, I don't care what amendments
17 they've made. It's too spectacular a place to trespass.
18 So, I thank you for your time.

19 MR. TURNER: Just for the record these meeting
20 minutes will be transcribed and will be on the public
21 record, the Commission's website, and so.....

22 Anybody else?

23 MS. MCMURREN: Is that where other documents can be
24 found in regard to this project are on that website?

25 MR. TURNER: Your name?

1 Ms. MCMURREN: Nichole McCurren.

2 MR. TURNER: Documents that have been filed with
3 the Commission can be found on our web page. Not all
4 documents that have been submitted strictly to Cascade
5 Creek, LLC could be found on our web page. Once they
6 file their final license application to us, we would
7 expect their entire file to be filed with the
8 Commission so we could consider that. And ultimately
9 it would be available. But if you want anything to be
10 on the record for the Commission to consider in our
11 analysis, I would advise you to file it with the
12 Commission as well as with Cascade Creek, LLC. Okay?

13 Anybody else got any comments?

14 ERIC LEE

15 statement as follows:

16 My name is Eric Lee, again. I just want to add a
17 comment about something that was mentioned at the last
18 meeting -- you guys were here. I don't want it to get
19 lost in this process. There was a comment about the
20 geological instability of the sea floor in Thomas Bay.
21 And the concern was that the instability could pose
22 serious problems for maintenance of the undersea cable.
23 And I would just like to make sure that that concern
24 does not get lost, is carried on in the process. So,
25 just wanted to remind you to perhaps look back at the

1 transcriptions or recordings and try and get that.
2 Because it sounded like a great valid concern. The
3 person who voiced it was very knowledgeable in Thomas
4 Bay, a charter boat operator. Thank you.

5 MR. TURNER: I think there was somebody else that
6 was fixing -- trying to get up.

7 MIKE STAINBROOK
8 statement as follows:

9 My name is Mike Stainbrook. And I've like to say
10 thanks, but I rather be frank tonight. I do not want
11 to see Cascade Creek developed period. And I do not
12 want a privatization of this public resource.

13 MR. TURNER: Anybody else? You got something to
14 say?

15 MR. MITCHELL: Yeah.

16 MR. TURNER: Oh, okay. Sure, I thought you were
17 pointing at somebody.

18 MR. MITCHELL: No.

19 DUFF MITCHELL
20 statement as follows:

21 For the record I'm Duff Mitchell. I'm the
22 Business Development Director at Cascade Creek and I
23 just wanted to address a couple things mentioned.
24 Cascade Creek has amicable relations with several
25 communities. Many of the questions that I saw tonight

1 written by the Mayor, and I wish he would be here. He
2 walked out. Could be easily answered with the Mayor
3 calling other Mayor's and working together. Another
4 thing I want to point out for the record is that a lot
5 of questions and issues raised tonight and other times
6 could have been resolved, and still can -- we've made
7 three official attempts to talk to your Council and to
8 have an amicable, not acrimonious, but an amicable
9 discussion of issues. And they have been turned down
10 several times as reported in your media. We still
11 offer that. I don't know if we're going to be able to
12 resolve the no development versus any development
13 divide. I don't know if we're going to be able to
14 resolve the private versus public ownership divide.
15 But unless you're willing to sit down and communicate
16 and work out, if it is going to be developed we would
17 certainly like to make it developed in Petersburg's
18 best interest. You have our commitment to work
19 together to resolve reasonable things. We have taken
20 the comments listed in the last public meeting, and I
21 wasn't here. I apologize I wasn't here then. But
22 there's been substantive and substantial changes in our
23 plan to address valid and reasonable concerns brought
24 out. And I think the record will show that and we're
25 still willing to take any comments and concerns and

1 continue on that effort to make this a win win
2 situation with the communities of Petersburg. Just
3 like we've attempted and been successful with the
4 communities of Wrangell and others. Thank you very
5 much.

6 MR. TURNER: Sure.

7 WARREN EDGLEY

8 statement as follows:

9 My name's Warren Edgley. I'm a member of the
10 Wrangell Borough Assembly. And what I've heard here
11 tonight -- it seems like the socioeconomic issues have
12 all centered around what this does or doesn't do for
13 Petersburg. But developing Thomas Bay is going to have
14 a socioeconomic impact on all of southern southeast. I
15 don't know in Petersburg -- we need more energy, that's
16 a fact. If we don't have more energy we're not going
17 to attract any business, we're not going to allow
18 existing industries to expand by producing more value
19 added products. We've got to have more energy and
20 we've got to get off five dollar a gallon heating oil.
21 And electric -- hydroelectric energy is one of the ways
22 to do that. I don't know what the situation is in
23 Petersburg, but in Wrangell we're continuing to slide
24 down hill economically. If you graduate from high
25 school in Wrangell now unless your daddy owns a boat

1 that he'll give you or a business, you've got to leave
2 town to get a job. We're losing all our young people.
3 So that's another impact and it's probably off point to
4 bring it up when we're considering a hydroelectric
5 project, but the socioeconomic impact of additional
6 energy in the region is not just centered in Petersburg
7 or Wrangell, it's for the -- all of southeast --
8 southern southeast. Thank you.

9 MR. TURNER: Anybody else? Okay. I just want to
10 remind folks that if you want to make any additional
11 comments or if you know of anybody else that couldn't
12 be here tonight, just let them know that we'll accept
13 comments up to July 20th. Even if they were to come in
14 a little later than that we would consider them. We
15 just need to have a cutoff date so that we can get --
16 begin processing this thing and trying to deal with the
17 issues and the information gaps to deal with those
18 issues.

19 I would also encourage you to go to our web page
20 at e-subscribe, you'll get notifications of everything
21 that -- if you have access to the web, you'll get
22 notifications of all the filings that come in from
23 anybody relating to this project. You can go to
24 www.ferc.gov and our e-library link and just put in the
25 project number, P-12495 in e-subscribe and you get a

1 notification of anything we issue or anything that's
2 filed in the Commission docket associated with this
3 project.

4 If you want to be put on our official mailing list
5 for this project, also you can send in a request to be
6 put on that. And there's a guide -- there's a -- on
7 page 23 of the Scoping Document there's directions of
8 how to get on our mailing list. And that would also
9 get any documents that we issue to you. We're very
10 early in the process. We've got a lot of work to do to
11 get the information to address the issues. And you'll
12 have an opportunity once it's filed -- the final
13 license application is filed with us well issue a
14 request -- we'll issue a notice of ready for
15 environmental analysis and at that point in time you'll
16 be able to file comments and recommendations again
17 about any kind of measures, any comments on the
18 application that it came in on -- that was filed, and
19 any recommendations that you would like to see that
20 project structured or operated or even not. We'll
21 consider those and produce a draft Environmental Impact
22 Statement, which will also be available for comment and
23 your reviews so you can tell us where we got it wrong
24 or where we got it right, hopefully. And then when we
25 issue a final EIS before we make our recommendations to

1 the Commission. So again, just before I close I want to
2 make sure if there's any questions with regard to the
3 process or comments please feel free. Your name?

4 MS. MCMURREN: Nichole McMurren. And I'm
5 whollfully uneducated about the -- sort of the project
6 and the process to date. But it sounds like there has
7 just been -- I travel quite a bit from work, so times
8 when there's conversations. I thought there was one
9 during the day when I actually was here in town and
10 working. And other meetings when folks are out. But
11 it seems -- you know this is not a really very
12 conducive kind of arena for Q & A and for getting --
13 for asking questions or putting on concerns. So I
14 don't know if you guys have been -- have you had other
15 just sort of community meetings where you're just sort
16 of around for a couple hours to chit-chat when folks
17 aren't working, you know not sort of at the kick off of
18 summer season and that kind of thing?

19 MR. SPENS: These are formal meetings, regulatory
20 meetings. And what you say makes all the sense in the
21 world. And we have had community meetings and
22 informational in Wrangell and involving Kake. We've
23 tried to make contact with Petersburg Council and
24 present or interact and have been declined.

25 But nonetheless, as a private company we could

1 interact freely, openly and would like to do that. We
2 also maintain a web site, thomasbayhydro.com. Where we
3 will provide information about this project and try to
4 keep it updated. We would like to do our best to be
5 accessible and responsive. It is complex as a process
6 and it's somewhat complex as a project. And I guess
7 our primary objective is to reach out, collaborate,
8 connect, try to coordinate activities and make the best
9 of the opportunity. And we certainly understand how
10 people feel about Thomas Bay as a resource. I.....

11 MS. MCMURREN: So you've looked at other areas and
12 other opportunities that perhaps wouldn't have such
13 visceral responses from folks who.....

14 MR. SPENS: I'd tell you after being in land use
15 planning for 20 years it doesn't really matter where
16 you go. If you propose an activity you get peoples
17 interest right off the bat. And then a proposed change
18 creates some anxiety by it's very nature. We are
19 trying to develop a hydroelectric project for the
20 benefit of people in a large geographic region. And
21 I'd be ready to share all information we have with you
22 to the extent you're interested.

23 ALBEUT HOWARD

24 statement as follows:

25 Hi, my name is Albeut Howard. I'm the Mayor for

1 the City of Angoon. Like most of you have stated your
2 fisherman, I'm also a fisherman. I have two boys at
3 home and a little girl, but I had to take time out here
4 to come and set the record straight. The City of
5 Angoon did not receive any payment for what we are
6 doing with Scenery. This type of statement implies
7 that we're doing something wrong. My community holds
8 us to a certain standard not to do anything such as
9 this is implying. My phone numbers for the City of
10 Angoon's in the book. You're welcome to call us if you
11 have any questions. We're open to any suggestions. I
12 went to Wrangell with my hand out, willing to work with
13 Petersburg and it didn't work out the way I had hoped.
14 This is important for everyone in the region. My
15 community is 87 percent unemployed. We have 472
16 citizens in the community, 25 percent of those are
17 veteran. If you come to my community you'll see -- you
18 can almost find one person that served in every
19 conflict. My father served in World War II, I was in
20 Desert Storm, I have a nephew that's serving now with
21 the Marine Corps. We have a lot of Viet Nam veterans.
22 We're not asking for handouts, we're here to work with
23 you. We've already made some steps to try to make
24 things right with Petersburg. But this implies that
25 we're doing some wrong doing, and I had to come and

1 make sure that the citizens know that this isn't how
2 the City of Angoon does business. We're above board
3 because our community, if you've read the papers, we've
4 just came out of a bad situation. And the States
5 holding us to certain standards and we have to maintain
6 those standards or we no longer get funding from the
7 State. And I can't jeopardize, you know my communities
8 standing in any circle. And this is implying something
9 pretty serious. So I had to come and address it, you
10 know take time out from supporting my family to address
11 this issue. We all have common ground, the high cost
12 of energy. The willingness to want to take care of our
13 family. This is the common thread that goes through
14 everybody, you can't say it doesn't. It's wanting
15 something better for your children. That's all we
16 want, that's all our community members want. We don't
17 want handouts anymore. Handouts got us to where we are
18 and it isn't working, so we're trying something
19 different is all we're doing.

20 If you look at the project that happening in our
21 community right now, we've SEACC, we've involved
22 Friends of Admiralty. This is a statement that I keep
23 close to me, that we take care of our environment
24 around home because it takes care of us. We would
25 never come into someone's backyard and do something we

1 wouldn't do in our own. I appreciate your time, but I
2 did have to come and set the record straight so your
3 community knows how we do business. Like everybody
4 else, I'll be busy until the end of August but after
5 that my number is in the book or the staff knows how to
6 contact me. I appreciate your time, thank you.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I just had an informational
8 question. Are you going to provide a list of e-mail
9 addresses, and places that you correspond -- you sited
10 a number of -- is there an informational sheet where we
11 can stay connected or do we have to go back to the tape
12 and ask you again to write it down?

13 MR. TURNER: Again to.....

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Or is it in -- I guess it's in
15 some document that you handed out.

16 MR. TURNER: Again, it's www.ferc.gov.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't have that. I didn't
18 pick up a sheet when I came in.

19 MR. TURNER: There's a whole bunch in the back.
20 Yeah. And as far as Thomas Bay stuff I think -- I'm
21 not sure if it's in here or not.

22 MR. SPENS: Yeah. I think we have it in there.

23 MR. TURNER: Yeah. It's in here too.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. I just didn't know
25 it was in there.

1 MR. TURNER: Is there anything else? Okay.

2 MATTHEW BELL

3 statement as follows:

4 Thank you very much. My name is Matthew Bell,
5 born and raised in Kake. Went to school and came back
6 and started my family. It's always good to come to
7 Petersburg and see friends. While the time isn't to
8 good to some of us, but I'm not going to look or point
9 to anyone.

10 I appreciate the opportunity of being able to
11 address each and every one of you tonight. Being a
12 Tlingit here in Southeast Alaska, we are taught not
13 only to respect our resources, respect the land,
14 respect the people. Those are the most important
15 points that have been instilled upon all of use. I'm
16 also a Board of Director of Kake Tribal Corporation.
17 Kake Tribal Corporation has pushing the same boat that
18 these guys have been in. I'm on the Board of Directors
19 for Cascade Creek. One of the things that we stressed
20 to Cascade Creek is do not do something that will
21 impact or affect our best interests. So with that
22 being said, I appreciate hearing everything you've all
23 said tonight. Thank you all.

24 MR. TURNER: Anything else? If nothing else I'll
25 move and close the meeting and thank you very much for

1 your time and participation tonight.

2 (Off record)

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25