

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATOR COMMISSION  
PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING FOR  
SUSITNA-WATANA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

Held at:  
Su-Valley Jr/Sr High School  
42728 S. Parks Highway  
Sunshine, AK

March 28, 2012

6:09 p.m.

1           MR. TURNER: For those that haven't met me  
2 already when I was out here earlier in August of last  
3 year, my name's David Turner. I'm a wildlife biologist  
4 with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, and the  
5 team lead for this for the Commission. Can't hear me?  
6 Okay. How's this back there? That much better. Okay.

7           Again my name's David Turner. I'm a wildlife  
8 biologist with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission,  
9 and team lead for the Commission on this licensing  
10 project. I'll let my colleagues here introduce  
11 themselves.

12          MS. CLARKSON: My name is Katie Clarkson. I'm a  
13 civil engineer with the Division of Dam Safety and  
14 Inspections in the Portland Regional Office.

15          MS. MCDONALD: My name's Lisa McDonald. And I  
16 work with the Louis-Berger Group, and I will be supporting  
17 FERC on the socioeconomic issues for the project.

18          MR. CUTLIP: I'm Matt Cutlip. I'm a fisheries  
19 biologist in Portland, Oregon in the Division of  
20 Hydro-Power Licensing, northwest branch.

21          MR. TURNER: Okay. We have a short presentation  
22 this evening. Just make sure everybody understands the  
23 license process, and what's going to be going on for the  
24 next three to five years longer. And then to talk about  
25 -- a little bit about what tonight's meeting is all about,

1 and the scoping and the reasons for it. Then I'm going to  
2 turn the floor over to Wayne Dyok to give a brief  
3 description of the project, and make sure everybody is  
4 onboard and understands what the project is -- entails and  
5 is all about.

6 And then we're going to get into the discussion  
7 of the issues. Given the volume of the crowd here, I'm  
8 gonna ask you to limit your comments to three minutes.  
9 And if -- if the end of that time we run through  
10 everybody -- and I'll go down the list of the sign-in  
11 sheet here and just call your name and have you come up;  
12 and give your presentation and your discussion. Again,  
13 hold it to three minutes. We'll let you know in about two  
14 minutes when you have a minute left.

15 And then at the end if we've gone through  
16 everybody and there's time left, we'll open up the floor  
17 again for others that may want to add to the record or  
18 didn't get a chance to speak or didn't think about it,  
19 they want to make some statement but didn't indicate they  
20 didn't want to on the sign-in sheets. Then we'll wrap up  
21 a few board dates to keep in mind in the very near future.

22 Again, we asked everybody to sign in. On the  
23 table we had a copy of the scoping document we issued that  
24 has a discussion of all the issues that we've identified  
25 based on the record so far before us. And we're going to

1 be seeking your input tonight on those issues, and what --  
2 what we might have missed and what you might want to add.  
3 But on the sign-in sheet we asked you to indicate if you  
4 want to make a statement, and that's the order of the  
5 focus that I'm going to call when we call people up to --  
6 to give your statement.

7 It is being recorded by a stenographer. So when  
8 you speak, we ask that you give your name, affiliation, if  
9 you have any; and -- and if you don't want to speak  
10 tonight or if you have additional comments you want to  
11 provide in writing, you can do so by April 27th; but  
12 actually, that date's likely to slip to May 31st. We just  
13 got last week a request for an extension of time to file  
14 comments by several federal agents, with the support from  
15 AEA.

16 So we're gonna -- we'll probably act on that next  
17 week, and extend the comment period to May 31st. Also, in  
18 the back of the scoping document is a list of individuals  
19 and entities that are on the Commission's official mailing  
20 list for this project. If you are not there and you want  
21 to be added, follow the instructions inside that book to  
22 be added. And the last bullet is probably one of the most  
23 important. And that is to go -- the Commission's Web page  
24 at [www.FERC.gov](http://www.FERC.gov); go to the eLibrary link, register, and we  
25 can receive notification by e-mail of any filings that are

1 made with the Commission for any issuances by the  
2 Commission.

3 When you register -- or when you look for that,  
4 be sure to register for the -- this project; which is  
5 project number 14241. And you need to put a P- in front  
6 of that number for our docket system to recognize this as  
7 a hydro project. This is a very brief overview of the  
8 licensing process that the Alaska Energy Authority, or AEA  
9 is going to be going through to develop application for  
10 the Susitna-Watana project.

11 It began with the filing and the notice of  
12 intent, and the pre-application document, or PAD, at the  
13 end of last year. And now we're in the scoping phase,  
14 which is part of our NEPA, or National Environmental  
15 Policy Act requirements, to scope out the issues that will  
16 be needed to be looked at in our environmental impact  
17 statement. And this is the point in time where we're  
18 trying to identify all the issues that we need to look at  
19 and consider in that EIS.

20 Also, we're going to be looking for study  
21 requests to deal with those issues. And once we have  
22 that, we're gonna come up with a study plan -- which is  
23 the study plan development stage. We're going to be  
24 developing studies to address those issues; and at the end  
25 of that process, AEA will have a study plan that the

1 Commission approves; and they have to go implement that  
2 study plan. That becomes basically the last box in that  
3 row. The study plan development and implementation phase.

4 As they develop it, they'll file their license  
5 application, and submit it to the Commission. Once the  
6 application is filed with the Commission, we'll review it  
7 for adequacy to make sure it comports with the regulations  
8 that we have; and to ensure that we have all the  
9 environmental information that we need to process that  
10 application and complete our environmental analysis.

11 When we do, we'll issue our ready for  
12 environmental analysis notice, which we call the REA  
13 notice. That is another opportunity for your review and  
14 comment on the project, and let us know what you -- or how  
15 you believe this project should be operated, and what kind  
16 of measures should be in there to address your concerns.  
17 And also, the notice that allows you -- or requests to  
18 intervene in the project; interventions are basically a  
19 proceeding that allows you to seek rehearing on the  
20 project's decision by the Commission.

21 With that information in hand we'll produce,  
22 again, the EIS. That EIS, we'll issue a draft, a final;  
23 and that will form the basis for the Commission's  
24 recommendations to -- the Commission's staff's  
25 recommendations to the Commission for a license decision.

1 This is a little more detailed overview of that brief --  
2 broader overview that I just showed you in the preceding  
3 slide.

4 And on this it has some of the dates that are  
5 coming up. And again, the filing of the notice of intent,  
6 pre-application document, in the end of December of last  
7 year, started us off in the integrated licensing process  
8 for the project. We issued the scoping document the end  
9 of February. We're holding scoping meetings. We've held  
10 meetings in Anchorage and Wasilla, so far. We're holding  
11 one here tonight; and Cantwell tomorrow night; and another  
12 team is holding them up in Glennallen tonight; and they'll  
13 be following up tomorrow night in Fairbanks.

14 Comments on the scoping document, again, are due  
15 April 27th; but this slide is probably outdated, and it  
16 should be May 31st. The applicant will -- or AEA will  
17 develop a proposed study plan by June. More likely -- all  
18 these dates are going to slip by a month when we grant the  
19 extension of time. So think of July for the proposed  
20 study plan. Then about a 90-day period where we work with  
21 AEA and stakeholders to resolve disagreements over the  
22 studies.

23 And they ultimately file comments on -- those  
24 study plans are due in September or October. They'll file  
25 a revised study plan that addresses those comments, and

1       then we'll issue a decision in October or November  
2       approving the study plan. That'll be followed by -- under  
3       the current schedule and proposal, is to cut to a couple  
4       years of studies, between '13 and '14; and followed by the  
5       filing of the license application by 2015 if all goes  
6       according to their schedule.

7               Well, it is -- it is part of the -- very  
8       important part of the process. Again, this is the point  
9       where we're making sure -- the environmental -- NEPA  
10      actually encourages early scoping to make sure that you  
11      understand the information -- issues at hand, and that  
12      you're gathering the information to deal with those  
13      issues. And that's really the purpose tonight; is we want  
14      to make sure to involve the public; to understand what's  
15      going on in your background; and what your issues are; so  
16      that we can look at them and understand those and get  
17      information to deal with those issues.

18             So we're looking for your input tonight on what  
19      those -- those are, that are relevant to this project and  
20      the operation of that project. The kinds of information  
21      that we're looking for are the geographic and temporal  
22      scope of the analysis for those issues. Any data that  
23      would help us describe the existing environment or the  
24      effects of this project; and are there other developmental  
25      activities going on in the basin that are going to

1       exacerbate or extenuate some of the effects of this  
2       project; or is this project going to interfere with those  
3       and make them worse.

4               We're looking for State and local resource  
5       management plans that we might want to consider and how  
6       this project might end that picture. We're looking for,  
7       again, the issues of your concern; and we're looking for  
8       any studies that you believe are necessary to address  
9       those issues. When we develop the integrated licensing  
10      process with not only State and federal resource agencies,  
11      tribes and NGOs, and others, we grant seven study criteria  
12      that are intended to help you describe to us any applicant  
13      -- what information is necessary to address your concerns;  
14      what kind of level of effort is -- you think is necessary  
15      to do that; and what kind of approach is necessary.

16             It's all intended to make sure that we understand  
17      what you think you need to deal with that. So you can  
18      provide a request for studies, as well as comments on a  
19      proposal. But you need to address each of these criteria  
20      in doing so. Again, the comments -- due date of request  
21      of studies is April 27th; but next week we'll probably  
22      issue an extension of time to May 31st.

23             All filings should include the project name,  
24      Susitna-Watana; and the project number, 14241. You can  
25      file them electronically through eLibrary, or hard copy to

1 the secretary, Kimberly D. Bose. But you don't want to  
2 send it to me directly. Everything needs to go into the  
3 docket and addressed to the Secretary. And with that I'll  
4 turn it over to Wayne.

5 MR. DYOK: Thank you, David. For the record, my  
6 name is Wayne Dyok, spelled D-y-o-k. I'm with the Alaska  
7 Energy Authority. And I'm the project manager for the  
8 Susitna-Watana project. I want to welcome you all here  
9 tonight. I think this is clearly an important issue for  
10 you all; and even though this is FERC's meeting, we are  
11 here as much as FERC is to listen to the concerns that  
12 you're going to raise; and we want to address all of the  
13 concerns.

14 Before I start talking about product, I just want  
15 to mention that we've reviewed the scoping document; and  
16 if you haven't had a chance to do that, we're developing  
17 study plans for every one of those issues. But that  
18 doesn't necessarily limit us to the number of issues that  
19 we study. We may go beyond what the Commission requires  
20 us to do to evaluate some issues. That is what we look at  
21 as a State issue. For example, glacial melt and health  
22 impact assessment are two items that we would be looking  
23 at.

24 Okay. So I'll give you a quick overview of the  
25 project, and then turn things back to David so we get your

1        comments. I'm sure you all know where the project is,  
2        about 90 -- upriver, it's about 90 miles upriver from  
3        here; at river mile 184. I'm sure you all know that it's  
4        upstream of Devil's Canyon. And the Devil's Canyon is a  
5        natural barrier for most of the anadromous salmon, except  
6        the king salmon. We're going to propose some pretty  
7        significant studies for those king salmon to make it  
8        upstream, to understand the situation.

9                We're looking at a dam that's going to be  
10        probably somewhere between 700 and 800 feet in height. It  
11        will have -- the reservoir would be 39 miles long with the  
12        700-foot height dam; and around 43 miles long with an  
13        800-foot high dam. We're looking at installing  
14        approximately 600 megawatts of capacity. Our  
15        pre-application document talks about three, 200-megawatt  
16        units. But it could easily be four, 150-megawatt units,  
17        or even some smaller units than the 150 megawatts; but  
18        we're still evaluating that.

19                The project would provide approximately  
20        two-and-a-half million megawatt hours, you know, annually.  
21        In the Railbelt right now, the annual energy need is  
22        around 5.4 million, you know, megawatt hours. So  
23        obviously 2-and-a-half million is little bit, you know,  
24        less than that -- you know, less than half of that number.  
25        One of the important things that a hydro project provides,

1 particularly for the hydro project like this, particularly  
2 for Alaska, is winter energy when we need it the most.

3 So we have run some studies to look at if we do,  
4 you know, build this project, that we want to push as much  
5 of the energy into the wintertime. And we want a very  
6 high reliability. So that 49 out of 50 years you can  
7 achieve the equivalent of a continuous flow of 200  
8 megawatts. And I'll talk a little bit about whether we  
9 would be able to vary that or not.

10 Okay. The project area; right now the Department  
11 of Transportation of Public Facilities is evaluating, you  
12 know, three alternative corridors. This northern one here  
13 we're calling the Denali Corridor. It would come off the  
14 Parks Highway and go along the Denali Highway here  
15 approximately 20 miles or so, and then 44 miles down here  
16 to the project site. It splits here, because if we pick  
17 this route, we would have a transmission line, as well as  
18 a road.

19 The Chulitna Corridor goes from the railroad east  
20 to the site; this one is 44 miles long; this one is 45  
21 miles long. And the bottom one here also goes from the  
22 railroad, and it's called the Gold Creek Corridor; it's  
23 50 miles long. The road would come this way, because it's  
24 pretty steep terrain here. You can cross it easily by  
25 transmission lines, but you couldn't do it very

1 effectively by road. So the road would come around this  
2 way.

3 The reservoir I mentioned would be 39 miles long.  
4 The upper end of it would be right around here; if we go  
5 with a higher dam, it would be a little bit further  
6 upstream right around here, downstream of the Oshetna  
7 River. This is a -- you know, honing in on the area.  
8 This shows the reservoir at full pool. Our studies are  
9 going to look at up to elevation 2,200. So it's higher  
10 than the highest elevation, but clearly within the  
11 influence of the -- of the project. So we wanted to do  
12 some pretty detailed studies in here, and also along these  
13 corridors.

14 You see the dam here. There is a construction  
15 camp that's proposed that would house approximately a  
16 thousand people at peak; with an average over the  
17 seven-year construction period of 800 people. Once the  
18 project is constructed, we would dismantle that camp, and  
19 we would have a permanent facility right here, maybe  
20 housing 20 to 30 people. We would have an airstrip. I  
21 think the plan right now is to fly the workers in from  
22 Anchorage and Fairbanks for the most part.

23 And then we have some Borough areas, and you want  
24 to have those Borough areas as close as possible to the  
25 dam itself. This is a conceptual, you know, site plan if

1       you're looking down on the dam. You have to build this in  
2       sequence. The first part of the process is to build the  
3       road, and you can see these gray lines here are the road.  
4       So you need to have access. Once you have access, then  
5       the next thing you would do is build the diversion tunnel.

6                You want to have continuous flow in the river at  
7       all times obviously. And then once that's done, you can  
8       put your diversion dams in; and then after your diversion  
9       dams, you can build your dam. We looked at three  
10      different kind of dams back in the 1980s; those of you  
11      that may have been around then. They were looking at a  
12      rock fill with an earth core dam, and it takes a  
13      tremendous amount of volume of material for a project like  
14      that.

15               It's -- over the last 25 years or -- a roller  
16      compacted concrete-type dam has really come into vogue;  
17      it's being used all over the world on projects in northern  
18      latitudes; and similar height dams as what we have here.  
19      Right now that looks like it's the preferred type of dam  
20      that we would use. Bradley Lake, which is on the Kenai  
21      Peninsula, that's another AEA project, that has 126  
22      megawatts. It is a rock fill with concrete face, so that  
23      kind of dam still has not been excluded; we're still  
24      evaluating that.

25               This is my last slide, and then we'll turn things

1 back to David for your comments. We're looking now around  
2 -- 13 years into the future to January 2025. And this is  
3 what a typical day in the Railbelt would look like in  
4 terms of energy requirements. On this axis is the  
5 megawatts that we would need. And this is the hour of the  
6 day. At nighttime the demand is lower; at breakfast  
7 people start waking up and turning on appliances; and  
8 you'll have a peak; and then they go to work; and you'll  
9 have a little bit of a decrease, but clearly it's still  
10 high.

11 And then everybody goes home, and you have a peak  
12 somewhere around 800 megawatts. It's not the highest  
13 peak, but it's a typical day in January. So it'd be a --  
14 generally higher, but not the highest peak. So there's  
15 two kinds of modes of project operation. I'm going to  
16 describe, you know, both of those; 'cause they're very  
17 different. And one requires a lot more study than the  
18 other; and we're going to study both of them.

19 And we -- we will have to see the results of  
20 those studies before we can make, you know, any kind of  
21 decisions. And that goes with pretty much any study that  
22 we're doing. We need to understand. We've got lots of  
23 information from the 1980s; there's been some additional  
24 data. But we have major plans to continue studies. This  
25 year, even though FERC doesn't require studies this year,

1 most of the money that we're spending this year is going  
2 to be for environmental studies. And that would be two  
3 major years of study; the next year and the following  
4 year.

5           So in an idealist -- idealized situation, what  
6 we're saying is, that all the other generation that we  
7 have in the system would provide this amount of energy  
8 down here; and would be equivalent to pretty much a  
9 constant amount of energy. But in that area you have wind  
10 projects, you'll have gas-fired projects; you'll have  
11 possibly the clean -- Healy Clean Coal Project. And any  
12 other -- some other hydros, the Bradley Lake. And we're  
13 saying, okay, in this case, it's a certain amount of  
14 energy that we would get; and then Susitna-Watana would  
15 provide the, you know, balance of that, you know, energy;  
16 okay.

17           So this amount of energy would be provided by  
18 Susitna-Watana. So in this schematic, this is the minimum  
19 amount of energy that you would need; that's around 200  
20 megawatts, a little bit less than that; and this would be  
21 the peak, which would be 400; but the project is actually  
22 sized for 600. And I want to give you a little bit of  
23 perspective, because it's important to understand this as  
24 we go forward. The project -- the maximum flow in the  
25 project would be 14,500 CFS going through the units.

1       Okay. So that's at 600 megawatts.

2               At 400 it would be about two thirds of that, so  
3       about 10,000 CFS; and down here maybe 4,000 CFS. Now, at  
4       Gold Creek -- there's a gauging station at Gold Creek.  
5       And at that particular location, the change in water  
6       level, if you went from the minimum flow that we would  
7       ever conceive of going through the units to the maximum  
8       flow, would change the water level there by 2.8 feet. And  
9       that's a sensitive place; that's the most the change would  
10      be.

11             Downstream -- or upstream of that to Devil's  
12      Canyon, that would be, you know, less than that.  
13      Certainly once you get here to Talkeetna where you have  
14      the confluence of the Chulitna and Talkeetna Rivers, it  
15      would be even less than that. But a gentleman yesterday  
16      said to me, that that 2.8 feet could be very important;  
17      absolutely agree with him. The 2.8 feet, if you're  
18      navigating this river -- those of you that go up there,  
19      that 2.8 feet is important.

20             So we need to understand the impact that that's  
21      going to have on the fish; as well as what it's gonna have  
22      on recreation users. And we have studies designed to get  
23      that kind of information. So what we're going to do is  
24      we're going to study one where we have no fluctuation; so  
25      we would flip this curve around; and then Susitna-Watana

1 would provide this amount of energy down here in a  
2 continuous, you know, basis during the wintertime; and  
3 pretty much during the summer. And that will give us one  
4 end of the spectrum.

5           And then we can look at the environmental effects  
6 of that. And then we'll look at the other end of the  
7 spectrum, generating like this. And we have talked to the  
8 Railbelt utilities, and obviously there's huge value in  
9 giving them flexibility. So we need to understand that.  
10 So it's important that we do that; that we understand  
11 that. It's also important that we understand what the  
12 minimum flows are.

13           The average flow in this river at Gold Creek is  
14 around 10,000 cubic feet per second. But in the summer,  
15 it's around 23,000 cubic feet per second. What we did so  
16 far with our energy studies here, is we assumed the  
17 environmental flow scenarios that they had developed in  
18 the 1980s. That has a minimum flow at Gold Creek of 9,000  
19 CFS. So that's a couple of feet difference on an average  
20 basis in the summer that you get today.

21           So again, we have to understand the effects that  
22 that has on visual quality, et cetera. And we have  
23 studies designed to do all that. So with -- with that I  
24 think I'll turn things back over to David. And we'll be  
25 very interested in hearing all your comments, and we

1 really appreciate the fine attendance that we have here  
2 today. I'm here to listen and learn. Thank you.

3 MR. TURNER: Thanks, Wayne. Again, we are here  
4 to hear what you have to say tonight, and we're interested  
5 in concerns as Wayne said. So with no further ado I'm  
6 going to turn it over -- the floor over to you. You've  
7 gotten a lot of information very quickly about the process  
8 and about the project; so if you have any questions about  
9 either, we'll be glad to entertain them.

10 But again, we're mostly here to hear your  
11 concerns about the project and the issues surrounding it  
12 from your perspective. We're going to ask you again to  
13 hold the comments to three minutes; I'll let you know when  
14 you have about a minute left. And I'm gonna go down the  
15 sign-in sheets, and indicate first just as we pick them up  
16 in terms of signed in and just call your name.

17 And so again, come up, take the mic, so everybody  
18 can hear you in the back, and give your name and  
19 affiliation so your comments can be attributed to you.  
20 And the first person I've got is Craig Campbell.

21 MR. CAMPBELL: My name's Craig Campbell. I'm a  
22 private citizen here in Talkeetna. So I raft and kayak  
23 and camp and fish on the Susitna River. And I've  
24 experienced kayaking on dammed rivers in the Lower 48 and  
25 overseas, and understand we have something special in this

1       wildly free-flowing river. So first I want to strongly  
2       voice my opposition to the proposed dam.

3               Second I want to remind you, you're deciding the  
4       fate, not of this project, but the fate of the river as a  
5       whole. And there's no way to mitigate the negative  
6       effects of the dam. And given that you are deciding the  
7       fate of this river, I'd like to invite the commissioners  
8       to spend time here this summer, or a summer in the future,  
9       floating the river to see what a special place it is.

10              But in terms of the scoping process, there are a  
11       few items that I would like to see addressed. There has  
12       never been a design -- a dam that is designed to fail, yet  
13       history shows they do. This dam is proposed to be built  
14       near a fault that was unknown prior to 2002, when it  
15       triggered its 7.9 magnitude earthquake. And it would be  
16       foolish to assume that we have perfect understanding of  
17       geology and engineering and that there is no chance of  
18       failure.

19              As someone living downstream near the river, I  
20       would like, A, a map and analysis outlining the areas  
21       flooded, and to what depth, as well as projected  
22       fatalities and economic damage in a variety of scenarios,  
23       including total dam failure. A plan for a warning system.  
24       If this happens; I'd like to know.

25              An analysis of what the increased risk that

1       you're undertaking will cost us in terms of higher home  
2       insurance premiums, and perhaps the necessity to have to  
3       buy flood insurance. I'm not in a floodplain, but I think  
4       I will be. At some point this dam will need to be  
5       removed; I would like to see a study of the cost  
6       associated with this removal and a plan as to how this  
7       will be paid for.

8               I'd also like to see -- this experiment's been  
9       run many times in California, in Washington, and Oregon,  
10      British Columbia. I want to see the results in the  
11      studies that show what happens to salmon in those rivers;  
12      what happens to recreation in those rivers. I think the  
13      experiments that failed and dams are being removed. And  
14      the last I just came up today looking through the  
15      Internet, the impacts of the source material. We're just  
16      talking about the impacts now of the river.

17              But I look at this RCC dam cost evaluation put  
18      out on November 16th, 2009. Talks about the source  
19      material, for instance, location of limestone deposits.  
20      Four possible locations; one is the Kings River nearby  
21      flows onto the Glenn Highway, as indicated by the name.  
22      It does support a salmon habitat. So I want to know --  
23      the second comes from the Cantwell-Windy area, which is in  
24      the Denali Wilderness Area. So where is the material, not  
25      just the aggregate, but the limestone for concrete coming

1 from? That's all.

2 MR. TURNER: Thank you. Next person I got here  
3 is Rob Hozt.

4 MR. HOZT: Yeah, I want to thank you guys for the  
5 opportunity to speak on this issue. I didn't really think  
6 much about it before this morning. But anyway, I think  
7 the -- the worst aspect of this -- of this dam, is what  
8 we're not doing with the money that we're going to use to  
9 spend on this dam. I spend a -- I used to spend a fair  
10 amount of time in villages around the state, and they're  
11 burning up diesel at 5 bucks a gallon to make electricity  
12 out there. And this ain't gonna help them at all.

13 And that's what you need to think about as a  
14 representative of the State. That is the most important  
15 thing in my mind, is what you're not doing while you're  
16 planning this job. And that's really about all I need to  
17 say.

18 MR. TURNER: Thank you. Ellen Wolf.

19 MS. WOLF: Thank you for the opportunity to  
20 comment this evening and for coming. I -- I oppose the  
21 Susitna Dam. But tonight I'm going to tell you about some  
22 stuff that I support. I support the Commission in its  
23 role mandated by Congress in 1986, that when considering  
24 power generation, you must give equal consideration to  
25 recreational, ecological, and other values of free-flowing

1 rivers.

2 I support the people here this evening, and  
3 elsewhere, who will share with the Commission their  
4 intimate and compelling knowledge of the myriad,  
5 irreplaceable values of a free-flowing river. And I  
6 support the other creatures that cannot speak for  
7 themselves about the values of an undammed river. I  
8 support the resource agencies -- I support the resource  
9 agencies in their daunting task of identifying all the  
10 issues and studies crucial to determining the impacts of  
11 the dam in terms of fish and wildlife, socioeconomics,  
12 hydrology and more.

13 And I support those agencies' informed opinion,  
14 that two years of studies is hugely inadequate; that six  
15 years would be a minimum. The time line for this project  
16 is way too short. Decision-makers, resource agencies, and  
17 the public, are all in whirlwind of an impossibly enormous  
18 series of tasks; reading the PADS; studying and trying to  
19 interpret Scoping Document 1; keeping up with dozens of  
20 workshop -- work group meetings. This will lead to  
21 mistakes, large and small.

22 I think maybe a mistake has already been made;  
23 our local radio station didn't receive a public notice  
24 about this meeting. Unless it's happened since -- is  
25 anybody from the radio station -- has it happened since?

1       There is now. This is now. Didn't come from -- I did a  
2       search after hearing this, of other Railbelt media, and I  
3       didn't find any public notice. I'm choosing to see this  
4       as a haste-makes-waste mistake, but it's not a small  
5       mistake.

6               Without notice, how can the public know to  
7       participate? Isn't FERC legally bound to publish notice  
8       of meetings? Okay. Moving on to the bottom-line question  
9       of this whole process. Is this dam the first of its size,  
10      and I think it's 50 years? Is this dam the best way to  
11      meet Railbelt electricity needs? No. With the century of  
12      data from the nationwide experiment that damming our  
13      rivers has been, we know that large hydropower projects  
14      destroy wild salmon populations and local economies, and  
15      forever alter recreational, ecological, cultural, and  
16      subsistence values of the river.

17             In the year 2012, how can anyone see this as the  
18      best way to generate a few hundred megawatts per year?  
19      The next question is, then how do we best meet our  
20      electricity needs? Beyond the fact that Cook Inlet has  
21      enough natural gas to meet these needs for decades to  
22      come; the answer starts with something from AEA's own Web  
23      site. Quote, "Energy efficiency and conservation are the  
24      low hanging fruit of efforts to meet sustainable energy  
25      goals. In Alaska, a defining energy goal is to improve

1 energy efficiency by 15 percent between 2010 and 2020."

2 Boy, do I support this. Here's a thought, rather  
3 then this stand, AEA should build a partnership. Build a  
4 partnership with Talkeetna to develop a pilot program of  
5 energy efficiency and conservation. Ours is a can do  
6 community. And we can certainly do this. I've no doubt  
7 of it; that we could do even better than 15 percent in  
8 improved energy efficiency.

9 We could do it for a fraction of the dam's \$4.5  
10 billion plus price tag. There's a lot we could do. At  
11 the same time, we need to support continued innovation and  
12 implementation of tidal, geothermal, wind, and solar  
13 energy projects. Some of that \$4.5 billion could go a  
14 long ways here too.

15 So thank you for listening. And I want to close  
16 by posing a question for you to ask yourselves. And I'll  
17 wait till everybody's listening, because I think it's an  
18 important question. If it sounds like a rhetorical or  
19 flippant question, I'm going to assure you that it isn't;  
20 because it's a question that we're all asking ourselves  
21 here.

22 Would you want to live downstream of a huge dam  
23 located 45 miles from the Denali Fault? Thank you.

24 MR. TURNER: Thank you. Doug Smith. Three  
25 minutes.

1 MR. SMITH: Three minutes.

2 MR. TURNER: And it needs to -- where it can be  
3 recorded by the court reporter, so hopefully it doesn't  
4 drown out.

5 MR. SMITH: You guys haven't set up for a banjo?

6 MR. TURNER: No.

7 MR. SMITH: Yeah, we'll start out with the mic  
8 here. This project is a dinosaur. Last time something on  
9 this scale was considered in the United States -- when it  
10 wasn't considered completely crazy, was in an era when  
11 many crazy things seemed normal; like doctors smoking in  
12 hospitals, and blacks having to use different restrooms  
13 than whites.

14 Did you know since then, people have evolved?  
15 And yet here we are in the age of the Prius, and it seems  
16 like you guys are trying to sell us a Packard Twin 6.  
17 Yeah, maybe like Rip Van Winkle, been asleep for six  
18 years; well, it's time to wake up. They're taking these  
19 things down now. You know, somehow you even got the State  
20 to give you \$500,000 to promote and advertise this -- this  
21 turkey. In the interest of fair play and public  
22 education, I'm requesting that you split the half million  
23 dollars of public funds, and give \$250,000 of it to the  
24 coalition for Susitna Dam alternatives.

25 I was jotting my thoughts down on this thing

1 going, yeah, we've done this here before. And Johnny Cash  
2 came on the radio singing, "I've been Everywhere, Man." I  
3 thought, okay, that inspired me to write this little song.  
4 Don't worry, it's short. It's called, "I've Heard  
5 Everything, Man." I'm nervous. (Singing song with  
6 banjo.)

7 "Well, I've heard everything, man. I've heard  
8 everything, man. I've heard your dam experts. I've seen  
9 your dam PowerPoint. I've been down to your dam meetings.  
10 I've heard everything. Well, when I -- well, I've heard  
11 when we're finished Susitna Dam and we aren't gonna hurt  
12 your salmon, but our research pretty cruddy, we've only  
13 two years of study. Hey. We act like there's no time to  
14 stare, bottom line is, we don't care.

15 When you -- don't you fret about an earthquake,  
16 our exerts say that it will not break. You can trust us,  
17 do not panic; classic words from the TITANIC. Well, you  
18 can take it with a grain of salt. Our cement's stronger  
19 than the Denali Fault. Well, I've heard everything, man.  
20 I've heard everything, man. I've seen your dam Web site.  
21 I've had your dam handouts. I've seen everything, man.  
22 Yeah, I've heard everything.

23 Well, when we're done Susitna blocking, industry  
24 will come a-knocking. You'll have every job you wish,  
25 unless you want to fish. It's development for its own

1       sake, is this the Denali Highway? God, it looks like Mile  
2       Lakes. Up and down our river goes, as you control the  
3       water flow. It floods in winter, summer's dry. Oh, but  
4       it won't hurt salmon fry. We can boat on gravel it --  
5       snow machining on a 10-foot wave.

6               And it's a lonely 5 billion, overruns a couple  
7       zillion. When you done with all your greed, no money left  
8       for other needs, finish off this conversation; why don't  
9       you dinosaurs get off your butts and support some  
10      conservation. Thank you.

11             MR. TURNER: Thank you. I'm hoping I'm getting  
12      this right. Dennis Rahsy.

13             MR. RAHSY: Yeah, I'm Dennis Rahsy. I'm a  
14      35-year resident, Talkeetna area. I hunt, fish, trap, and  
15      recreate on the Susitna and Talkeetna Rivers. I live near  
16      the Talkeetna River. I oppose the dam for the following  
17      reasons. There are numerous unanswered question  
18      concerning fisheries, changed flow rates, changed water  
19      temps, nitrogen levels in the water, mercury  
20      concentrations in the water, loss of side slews, changed  
21      break-up and freeze-up times.

22             AEA constantly claims that the studies will clear  
23      up all unknowns. However, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife  
24      Service, ADF&G, National Park Service, and Nymphs claim  
25      that the study time frames are too short. These questions

1 will not be adequately answered in two years of studies.  
2 The life span of chinook salmon is five to seven years.  
3 One would think that Alaska's most valued fish would at  
4 least be adequately studied before some populations may be  
5 rendered extinct.

6 I just heard recently from a fairly reliable  
7 source, that king salmon fishing is going to be restricted  
8 this year. They're cutting down the time and the bag  
9 limits. And we've been hearing from various sources,  
10 mostly Fish & Game, and they are already stressed. This  
11 is not the time to make it even harder for them. Several  
12 technical meetings have been held over the last few  
13 months. Most of these problems were brought up then, by  
14 AEA staff and contractors.

15 Cheap power is a myth. The ratepayers who are --  
16 seem to -- some of who are raising Cain that this is going  
17 to make power cheap enough for everybody with unlimited  
18 power to -- for consumers, the ratepayers are eventually  
19 gonna pay for every penny of this dam. Utilities and  
20 State will see to that. High seismic activity in the  
21 project vicinity is a major problem.

22 AEA claims that the dam will take any earthquake  
23 imaginable. Of course, they don't live directly  
24 downstream from it. This fact alone leads one guided by  
25 logic and care for human life to look elsewhere for

1 energy. Alternatives exist. The State could drop its  
2 prejudice for mega projects and understand bigger is not  
3 always better. Wisdom dictates that we search for less  
4 harmful, less risky, less disruptive, and more  
5 cost-efficient ways.

6 Already established on the Susitna for many  
7 years, river sightseeing, float trips, hunting, fishing,  
8 scenic flights, dog mushing, snow machining, skiing. I  
9 probably left somebody out here, but I mean everybody that  
10 use -- there represents a lot of lives that would be  
11 altered by the dam. Wetland loss and in-stream flow  
12 changes along the entire river would be significant  
13 problems.

14 The river mouth, it's critical habitat for beluga  
15 whales, under the Endangered Species Act. Lower river and  
16 mouth have not been adequately studied. It seem like the  
17 studies ignore everything downstream of Talkeetna.

18 MR. TURNER: Dennis, can you wrap it?

19 MR. RAHSY: Can I what -- yeah. The 80 square  
20 miles, more or less flooded by the reservoir, would  
21 permanently displace all wildlife there. Long-term  
22 effects are unknown. Nelchina caribou, which crosses the  
23 river there, are at especially high risk. So all you  
24 caribou hunters out there might want to think about that.

25 The project is unsound by any logical measure.

1 We need to be a lot more creative, build energy projects  
2 that don't harm our homes and countryside. And also,  
3 there haven't been adequate studies of the tributary  
4 rivers and creeks. It's not just the main stem that's  
5 going to be affected. I guess that about wraps it up.

6 MR. TURNER: If you have something else to add  
7 after everybody gets a chance, you can come back. Next  
8 person will be Roberta Sheldon. I think I have that  
9 right, Roberta Sheldon.

10 MS. WOLF: This is Ellen Wolf for Roberta  
11 Sheldon. Roberta says, "I am a lifelong Alaskan who has  
12 lived in Talkeetna for 48 years. The Susitna River, one  
13 of Alaska's premier waterways, travels from its headwaters  
14 in the Alaska Range, to Cook Inlet. Along the way it  
15 joins with the Chulitna and Talkeetna Rivers at the  
16 western rim of Talkeetna. Where most residents and local  
17 economy rely primarily on wilderness and the rivers.

18 "The proposed Susitna Dam would change all that.  
19 The dam's economic impact on Talkeetna's dynamic sports  
20 fishery would be crushing. Professionally guided trips  
21 for all five species of salmon, including silvers, king,  
22 sockeye, chum, and pinks, provide principal income for  
23 charter boat operators here. All these species depend  
24 upon, or interact with the Susitna River.

25 "Major concerns about the corruption of the

1 river's seasonal flow rates, crucial salmon spawning, side  
2 slews, temperatures, silt content levels, and water depths  
3 are a problem. There are -- these are complex issues that  
4 require thorough examination to be at all credible. Last  
5 year in August a meeting was held in Talkeetna with the  
6 Alaska Energy Authority and some FERC representatives; at  
7 that time, attending State and federal resource agencies,  
8 such as Alaska as Fish & Game, voiced deep concern that  
9 the time frames allotted by AEA and FERC to complete  
10 studies, were sorely insufficient to produce the results  
11 required of them.

12 "To my knowledge, nothing tangible has been done  
13 since then to address this critical concern. I find this  
14 deeply disturbing and ask that you grant your immediate  
15 attention to it. We are told that the proposed dam would  
16 trap the normal flow of water in a giant reservoir in  
17 summer, and would release larger amounts than normal in  
18 winter. This can only impact the natural's -- river's  
19 natural critical production of high summer water and low  
20 depths in winter.

21 "Also, AEA staff has implied that once the  
22 reduced Susitna flow reaches the confluence of the  
23 Talkeetna and Chulitna Rivers, these two major tributaries  
24 would replenish the Susitna's flow. This seems naive at  
25 best. A dammed diminished river is a diminished river,

1 plain and simple. One that passes its defects into a  
2 Lower Susitna, as greater salmon runs into the Susitna  
3 Valley.

4 "I'm also disturbed that you are fast-tracking  
5 this dam at a rate that is unreasonable, considering its  
6 enormity and complexity. Mr. Dyok, project manager, has  
7 been quoted in a speech to the Wasilla Chamber of Commerce  
8 recently, that AEA will ask for 2- to \$3 billion in State  
9 appropriations from our Legislature next year. This is  
10 fast-tacking at an alarming rate, before the studies and  
11 acquisition of vital data have even been conducted.

12 "AEA projects -- projects the cost of the dam to  
13 be an estimated 4.5 billion. But factoring in costs not  
14 revealed yet by the agency, the estimate now appears to be  
15 6.5 billion and climbing. Talkeetna dates back to 1918,  
16 and registered as the Talkeetna Historic District in the  
17 State of Alaska. It is also an economic engine that  
18 depends on the natural resource values here, not the least  
19 of which is the Susitna River.

20 "One estimate of our visitation is put at a  
21 hundred thousand visitors annually, and others put it  
22 higher. Remember, please, you are considering a proposed  
23 project that would alter an entire ecosystem -- value.  
24 And that -- and one that would deeply affect the  
25 hard-earned economies of long-time Alaskans. Thank you,

1 Roberta Sheldon."

2 MR. TURNER: Howard Corbone next, please.

3 MR. CORBONE: I'm Howard Corbone. I'm a  
4 Talkeetna resident, and a small business owner. I'm here  
5 out of concern for the negative impacts the Susitna-Watana  
6 Dam would have on my family, my life, and my livelihood.  
7 We moved to this area below the proposed dam in 1997,  
8 because of its wildness, abundant wildlife, and rural  
9 lifestyle. We built a home; founded a successful tourism  
10 business; and started a family. The Susitna project puts  
11 all of this at risk.

12 The Susitna Dam project threatens our family  
13 tourism business, which we started in 2004. Visitors come  
14 to see the abundant wildlife and spectacular scenery, and  
15 to experience an area that has been left natural. This  
16 project and associated industrializing of the area, would  
17 mar the landscape and impact populations of salmon, which  
18 are the foundation of Alaska's food web.

19 The resulting loss of wildlife and wildness,  
20 would have large negative impacts on our clients'  
21 experience and their perception of this area,  
22 significantly affecting our ability to attract customers.  
23 And in an area with such a short tourist season, this  
24 could destroy our family's sole source of income and our  
25 area's tourism based economy.

1           Susitna Dam project would also create safety and  
2 access problems for our business. We guide snowshoe hikes  
3 on the frozen Susitna River in the winter. The dam would  
4 result in more open water in winter, blocking our access  
5 to some parts of the river. In others, thin ice would be  
6 a life-threatening hazard. The Susitna Dam project also  
7 threatens our food supply. We rely heavily on moose and  
8 wild salmon runs from the Upper Susitna River for our  
9 family's subsistence.

10           Agencies responsible for assessing ecological  
11 impacts, report that they are being rushed to make  
12 conclusions before adequate studies can be done. This  
13 should be a huge red flag to you. I urge you to wait for  
14 the science to be done, especially an exhaustive study on  
15 impacts of salmon before considering this project. If the  
16 project is shown to have any negative effects on salmon,  
17 FERC should not license the dam.

18           Moose and caribou populations could also be  
19 heavily impacted by the dam. Ice would form on the lake  
20 in early winter. As the lake's water level drops through  
21 the winter, it will leave behind shelves of thin, unstable  
22 ice. In late winter, moose often venture onto wind-swept  
23 lakes and rivers to escape deep snow. Any large animal,  
24 such as moose or caribou or people venturing out on this  
25 ice, would likely fall through.

1           The lake could be a black hole for moose and  
2           caribou, killing untold numbers and impacted populations  
3           for a vast area. I'm also concerned about the  
4           consequences of catastrophic failure of the dam structure.  
5           Never before has such a large dam been built so far north  
6           in such an earthquake-prone area. The combination of the  
7           very thick ice and the -- the earthquake -- an earthquake  
8           in the area, could create a large, dynamic load that could  
9           cause catastrophic failure.

10           MR. TURNER: Can you wrap up, Howard?

11           MR. CORBONE: When I first heard about this  
12           project it seemed to have many benefits. Now, that I have  
13           considered the tremendous cost, the far-reaching negative  
14           effects, and the existence of viable alternatives, I have  
15           concluded that this project should not happen. I urge  
16           FERC to do the same and to deny the license for this  
17           project.

18           MR. TURNER: Thank you. I apologize, I skipped  
19           over someone here. Art Stetsman or Stetna. I can't quite  
20           make out your last name.

21           MR. WETTAN: My name is Art Wettan, from  
22           Talkeetna. I've lived here a long time. What I have to  
23           say is that the hydropower is the best bet on energy  
24           sources, compared -- I mean, water's free. It's a  
25           long-term source. Compared to -- hydropower, compared to

1 nuclear power, uranium costs will increase in time.

2 Japan just shut down all their reactors, except  
3 for one. They got 54. We all know what the tsunami wave  
4 did over there. Germany's going the same route; they shut  
5 down 8 out of 17. So they don't think too much of nuclear  
6 power. Coal has a costly emissions scrubbers to install.  
7 It's getting more and more costly all the time to comply  
8 with the emissions. Oil is volatile. Natural gas in  
9 Alaska. We still have a need for it, but at what cost is  
10 a consumer willing to pay for natural gas?

11 We all know fossil fuels spike, go up and down.  
12 Solar, wind, is an unproven -- reliable. They just spike;  
13 they don't have a steady flow. Last of all I got to say  
14 is, that if we build this dam, we're talking about energy  
15 sources for a Rural Bush, Western Alaska. There's 144  
16 villages out there being subsidized by the Power Cost  
17 Equalization Program.

18 If we build a transmission line from Su Hydro  
19 over to Western Alaska, we can electrify all these  
20 villages, and end this needless Power Cost Equalization  
21 Program where we're spending \$189 million last year. And  
22 that's been going on for 10, 20 years. And what do we get  
23 for that? Nothing but smoke. So again, water's free; and  
24 hydropower's the best bet for our long-term energy  
25 sources. Thank you.

1           MR. TURNER: Thank you. Next person I got is  
2 Israel Mahay.

3           MR. MAHAY: Hello. Start, I am opposed to the  
4 Watana-Susitna Dam project. I am a 34-year resident of  
5 Talkeetna; basically I -- born and raised here. And also  
6 run Mahay's Boat Service with my father. We started the  
7 company in '75, and we have been running the Susitna River  
8 since then. And for the last 16 years I have been running  
9 trips up the Susitna River. And actually for the last 10  
10 years, we go up into the Devil's Canyon every day; be  
11 about a 120-mile trip.

12           And I go two miles up into the whitewater, class  
13 four and five whitewater; we stop right in front of a  
14 major classified rapid; hold the boat there for about 20  
15 to 30 minutes; and if you haven't done it, it's one of the  
16 most amazing things you've ever seen in your life; it's  
17 absolutely beautiful. And with the flow rates that you're  
18 talking about now, we're not going to be able to do that.

19           In the fall time we actually have to quit that  
20 trip early, because the flow rates drop far enough down  
21 that we can't run it anymore. So basically we would be  
22 out of business, per se, with that trip. So socioeconomic  
23 effects would be drastic for us. We put 20,000 people, I  
24 think, was our numbers for last year, on our boats. And  
25 we would be very impacted by this. And I would hope that

1 we would do the socioeconomical studies on that impact.

2 We mentioned earlier -- somebody said a hundred  
3 thousand tourists come to Talkeetna, I believe the  
4 figure's more like about 120,000. And it's the main  
5 driving force of this whole area. And people don't come  
6 to Talkeetna to see a dam; they come here to see a wild  
7 river, and basically wilderness. It's kind of funny; a  
8 lot of times I'll be going up the river, my clients will  
9 look out and will go, man -- they go, where -- where's,  
10 you know, where is everything? And I'm like, yeah, isn't  
11 that cool? You know.

12 And this is one of the last free-flowing rivers  
13 of this size in the world. And do we really have to dam  
14 every single one of them?

15 MR. TURNER: Thank you. I got two people here on  
16 the same line, a Dan and Nancy Ebner. Would one of you  
17 like to take the floor?

18 MR. EBNER: I don't have much to say. I'm a bus  
19 driver, and I like kids; and I got a whole bunch of  
20 grandkids; and I like you guys too. And I don't want to  
21 be embarrassed when my kids ask me when I'm a  
22 hundred years old, why did you do that? Why'd you let  
23 them do that? It's ridiculous. All the stuff that are  
24 bad about it, not to mention a few things that I could  
25 think about too, that we just can't -- \$4.3 billion --

1       anyway. My kids are going to be mad at me if you guys  
2       build that.

3               MR. TURNER: Thank you, Dan.

4               MS. EBNER: Let me add to that, my husband --

5               MR. TURNER: You're Nancy?

6               MS. EBNER: This is the reason why -- I'm Nancy  
7       Ebner; Dan's wife. And the granddaughter had me running  
8       so -- she's my fishing buddy; and as you can see, I wore  
9       my beaver shirt today. I'm from Oregon. We don't need  
10      this. We really don't need this. We've done this before;  
11      we've seen what happens. We want to keep this place wild  
12      for our children, our grandchildren. I want them to see  
13      what I've seen since I've come up here. Thank you.

14              MR. TURNER: Thank you. Richard Leo.

15              MR. LEO: My name is Richard Leo. I'm a 30-year  
16      resident of Trapper Creek where I homesteaded. First  
17      thing I want to address is the spiritual aspect of the  
18      dam. This is something that FERC will not accept as part  
19      of its considerations for whether the dam gets built or  
20      not, and I understand that. The fact remains that, this  
21      is the heart of what the problem really lies in. This  
22      area is, in fact, the heart of the beauty of Alaska.

23              It's what our children and grandchildren, and  
24      great-grandchildren and their grandchildren require, as we  
25      do, for our lives; something greater than us. The fact

1 that we would destroy it by building a dam that would  
2 devastate the entire ecosystem and reduce everything of  
3 awe and beauty that we know -- most value here. The fact  
4 that that's not something FERC considers for a second in  
5 its considerations of whether the dam should be built, is  
6 both understandable, given the requirements that FERC  
7 operates under; and it's also insane.

8 The truth that FERC has very specific  
9 requirements of what it will consider as to whether the  
10 dam should be built or not, is what I'd like to address  
11 next. There are many alternatives to this dam. The  
12 bottom line is that the dam is simply not necessary. A  
13 dam of this magnitude is even less necessary. It will get  
14 an average of 300 megawatts a year. That power is  
15 25 percent of what the Railbelt needs; the area of the dam  
16 concern, for its energy needs.

17 The dam will not address heating needs. That's  
18 natural gas. Natural gas is extinct now. Natural gas is  
19 here available for at least a hundred more years if we tap  
20 it. We have enough natural gas now to power us through  
21 for 20, 25 more years as it exists right now, as we --  
22 already, until other sources of energy come online, such  
23 as tidal power, of the -- even potential for geothermal  
24 power.

25 The fact remains, that the public is not informed

1 about what the issues of the dam really are. That's a  
2 failing of AEA; that's something that FERC needs to  
3 consider; just as it was pointed out that there was very  
4 little notice from FERC about these kinds of meetings,  
5 when AEA offers its own perspective on the dam, it's  
6 basically just a shill pitch for what is beneficial in the  
7 dam. Not what the potential risks are. And the risks are  
8 enormous, especially given the fact that the dam isn't  
9 necessary.

10 So I would ask FERC, please, to not just consider  
11 what the agency requests for long study time is important,  
12 but that the public needs to have greater opportunity to  
13 be able to comment in situations like this, so that you  
14 can hear the extent of opposition as they become familiar  
15 with the issues. Thank you.

16 MR. TURNER: Thank you. I'm having difficulty  
17 reading this last name. I think it's Ed Croper or Crove.

18 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Crava.

19 MR. TURNER: Crava.

20 MR. CRAVA: Alaska has never been a stranger to  
21 weird and harebrained ideas. I remember -- I think it was  
22 in the late '60s, early '70s, of where some -- it was  
23 probably a Legislature, came up with the idea of spreading  
24 coal dust over the Arctic Slope to get rid of all that  
25 worthless and unnecessary ice. And it wasn't that long

1       ago. I mean, we had people talking about moving the  
2       capitol to Willow. Willow probably deserved it. But I  
3       mean -- but that's not a good idea. But this -- this  
4       whole thing of disrupting and destroying such a vast and  
5       major ecosystem; for what? I mean, you know, we got the  
6       availability of gas.

7                I mean, you know, we can pursue the whole tidal  
8       wave source of energy. I mean, there's so much out here.  
9       But here we go again; you know, coming up with something  
10      that is completely preposterous. But there's so many  
11      aspects of this. I mean, the other day my little dog  
12      heard me talking with a friend, and she -- she left. And  
13      they said, "Dad, does this mean if they build that dam I'm  
14      going to have to wear a life vest?"

15               And I said, "No. AEA will provide guardian  
16      angels for everybody if that damn dam breaks. I mean, the  
17      angels will come down and rescue us all." But then he  
18      said, "Dad, there's 20,000 dead Japanese. Why didn't the  
19      government find guardian angels for all of them when the  
20      tsunami hit?" So this is, you know -- I don't want to  
21      make a light of the whole thing, but it is -- it's very --  
22      it's just beyond the king of -- of good sense, you know.

23               There was a wonderful thinker, St. Thomas  
24      Aquinas, who talked at length about how humans could  
25      cultivate ignorance; that rather than just realizing what

1 they were saying, it was pure stupidity. But they  
2 convince themselves -- and I think this is what's  
3 happening here now -- is we have people who have convinced  
4 themselves, that, oh, my gosh, of course, an 800-foot dam  
5 sitting on a fault, I mean, why it's the perfect pairing.

6 But then when you put all of your energy eggs in  
7 a basket with a crack at the bottom, you know what's going  
8 to happen. Thank you.

9 MR. TURNER: Thank you. Next person is Kirby  
10 Spangler.

11 MR. SPANGLER: Hi, I'm Kirby Spangler. And I'm  
12 affiliated with the salmon, among other things. I went to  
13 the hearing last night in Wasilla. And I shared some of  
14 my concerns with the dam with the Commission, and I  
15 listened as many others spoke out against the dam in  
16 Wasilla. Not as many as are here, but -- hey, George.  
17 This -- this experience left me profoundly dissatisfied.  
18 So I came tonight to share some of my observations and  
19 experiences.

20 Since the beginning of the industrial revolution,  
21 four fifths of the world's salmon have been exterminated.  
22 How could that have happened? How could we have let that  
23 happen? Well, this process is how it happens. This  
24 process that we're all engaged in here, is how it happens.  
25 This meeting -- I got this all written down. Just a

1 little chaos.

2 This Commission, this dam, one project, one  
3 river, one genetically unique population at a time. The  
4 system in which we are now participating with our public  
5 testimony, is one of licensing and permitting the  
6 eradication of wild salmon. This many seem like an open  
7 and democratic process; but in effect, it is the opposite.  
8 We might ask, how often does the Commission deny a  
9 license? Or we might ask the DNR, how often does it deny  
10 a mining permit?

11 Public hearings serve the function of  
12 channelizing and controlling dissent. The job of these  
13 folks is to go back to their offices, and engineer and  
14 rationalize work-arounds to all of our concerns. Ultimate  
15 -- and ultimately to issue a license for a dam. Our  
16 participation in the process allows us to feel as if we  
17 have done something to prevent an atrocity. Most of the  
18 world's remaining wild salmon come home to Alaska's  
19 rivers. Why is this? Are we somehow different? More  
20 enlightened managers of resources?

21 The myth would have us believe that we now have  
22 the better regulations and better technology. That we are  
23 finally ready to do this right. This is a lie. We are  
24 headed down exactly the same path that exasperated the  
25 rest of the world's salmon. I'm not going to stop

1 talking. This Susitna Dam, the Peddle Mine, and the  
2 headwaters at Bristol Bay; the Chulitna Coal Mine, that  
3 proposed to strip mine through 11 miles of salmon spawning  
4 stream; the Wishbone Hill Mine.

5 These are all parts of a larger hole that, if  
6 completed, will leave Alaskans crying over lost salmon,  
7 just like everywhere else. This dam is not about  
8 electrical power for Alaskans. It's a State-subsidized  
9 infrastructure project meant to facilitate the wholesale  
10 looting of Alaska natural resources for the benefit of  
11 private corporations. They're eating into my time.

12 They're eating into my time.

13 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Let him finish.

14 MR. SPANGLER: Don't worry; I'll finish.

15 MR. TURNER: I'd like to make sure everybody gets  
16 a chance.

17 MR. SPANGLER: I know; me too. Believe me. If  
18 we want to save the salmon, we need to be here tonight to  
19 participate in the charade. We also need to bring our  
20 Mat-Su Borough Assembly back from the brink this October.  
21 But we also need to work in solidarity across issues for  
22 systematic change. This means that we need to take our  
23 actions outside of State-sanction channels.

24 U.S. history shows us that direct action is  
25 essential to any campaigning for systematic change. I

1 don't know if anybody has noticed, but direct action seems  
2 to be back as a political force in America. And this is  
3 where I just stopped scribbling. But the last thing I  
4 want to say, is that I will be working to organize a  
5 series of workshops this summer; I'll be bringing some  
6 activists up from West Virginia who work on mountaintop  
7 removal coal mining issues; and we'll be doing a series of  
8 workshops; hopefully, around the state and different  
9 communities; mostly geared towards mining -- direct action  
10 in mining issues. But we do all need to work in  
11 solidarity to change this system. Thank you.

12 If anybody's interested in putting something like  
13 that together here, you know, or come into one of the  
14 other ones or just find -- learning more; let me know  
15 somehow.

16 MR. TURNER: Sandra Lewis.

17 MS. LEWIS: Hi, I'm Sandra Lewis. And I've been  
18 living in the Su Valley since I was 12. Even before that  
19 we came here with my grandparents; and we've eaten caribou  
20 and moose and salmon since I was very little. It breaks  
21 my heart to think they're going to build an 800-foot dam  
22 here. And it just -- the numbers don't seem to add up in  
23 my brain.

24 An 800-foot dam and a whole lot of -- has anybody  
25 asked about the weight on the fault? And if that will

1 have any impact on the seismic activity? And maybe I  
2 should ask a question about how to ask about studies,  
3 because there are other studies here I'd like to ask about  
4 that don't seem to be included. The value of the river,  
5 and it is a main life river for the State of Alaska right  
6 in the heart, and that's been said a few times; but I  
7 guess I'd like to repeat that.

8 We've rafted on the river, fished on the river;  
9 it's just a part of a life. Been in tourism; worked in  
10 tourism my whole life. My children work in tourism. It  
11 is our life. So it would be ruining our life. But, hey,  
12 I guess we need energy; but we do need energy, but is that  
13 the best way. And there are studies out there already  
14 that have said that multiple small projects are really the  
15 best alternative. So obviously I do oppose the dam, and I  
16 would like FERC to deny the license; because there are  
17 great alternatives.

18 Also, there is plenty of natural gas; as Rick Leo  
19 said, for a hundred years. So I'd like to see some of the  
20 political will that's being put towards this dam, which  
21 doesn't really make sense, towards natural gas; because  
22 there is a lot of it; it just -- there's no political will  
23 to do it; and the State already owns it. The salmon.  
24 Okay. We already know that this -- I mean, I don't think  
25 you have to have studies really to know that that dam's

1 going to ruin the salmon run here. It's already at the  
2 tipping point.

3 We've fished it for years; it used to be very,  
4 very, very, very good. And it's not as good as it was at  
5 all, not even close. I don't think there's any question.  
6 I don't think we really need the studies; but if we do  
7 have the studies, which we should obviously have, because  
8 that's the way you do it; two years; that's not enough.  
9 It's not enough time. Failure. I would like to request a  
10 study in public interest, for my interests, and my  
11 children's interest, and my grandchildren's interest, of  
12 catastrophic failure.

13 I mean, it's easy to look on the Internet,  
14 there's catastrophic dam failures. There's been them ever  
15 since dam's been built. It is on a fault line, it will  
16 have a lot of water. I looked up myself a study on the  
17 wave factors when there is catastrophic failures, how the  
18 waves act when it fails. And if that -- that those are  
19 out there. It needs to be done; I would like to know.

20 Also RCC info, it's so cool, it's like compact  
21 and it's strong. But it also only has 25 years; and it  
22 also hasn't been built in very extreme, cold weather very  
23 much anywhere. And there's actually big questions about  
24 -- in all the stuff I found in some of the Chinese dams  
25 and some of the dams in Spain, they really say it needs

1 more study, it need more research on cold weather and the  
2 effects of cold weather and what finds -- what little  
3 finds it's used -- and how it affects, between the rolls  
4 and the seeps.

5 And the dams are failed for floods, for debris,  
6 for operator error. Operator left a tool in the turbine.  
7 I mean, there's all kinds of failures. So please research  
8 the failure. I'd like to know. And please deny.

9 MR. TURNER: Thank you. Josh Klauder.

10 PUBLIC SPEAKER: He said he'll submit it in  
11 writing.

12 MR. TURNER: Okay. Ellie Kenke.

13 MS. KENKE: Appreciate you folks coming tonight.  
14 My name is Ellie Kenke, and I'm a real year-around  
15 resident of the Talkeetna community. First I'd like to  
16 call your attention to the difficulty of accessing the  
17 Scoping Document No. 1 on the FERC Web site. Even with  
18 the document number, I was unable to access the document.  
19 And I thank the Susitna Dam Coalition for providing that  
20 link on the Web site, was the only way I could actually  
21 get to it.

22 I didn't know about the P in front of the number.  
23 I had the number; I had the name; and it would not go  
24 through. So I'd like to request that you get a better way  
25 of accessing this material. Let me say right away that

1 many people in this community, myself included, feel that  
2 we're being railroaded with this project. A previous  
3 version of this proposal was turned down; now it's raised  
4 its head again; and the AEA is trying to get the dam built  
5 as fast as possible.

6 When -- from positions of ignorance, every single  
7 politician came out in support of this project, even  
8 before there was much analysis or discussion. We're now  
9 on a fast track, and various government agencies are  
10 already asking for more time for analysis and comment. My  
11 first comment is that the whole time line is too rushed.  
12 We need to take time, do the evaluations, and make sure we  
13 understand the entire energy picture of which this dam is  
14 -- is only a part.

15 We also need to really understand the  
16 consequences of building this dam. Once we start down the  
17 wrong path, it's really hard to turn around. Let's get it  
18 right, rather than trying to repair the damage later. In  
19 its licensing procedure, FERC will be trying to determine  
20 if the Susitna-Watana Dam project is in the public  
21 interest. I submit that this analysis must be in the  
22 context of a larger energy picture. You don't have to  
23 license this particular project.

24 Let's make sure that what we build is the right  
25 thing to serve our needs. First, let's begin with an

1 entire energy needs assessment. What do we use our energy  
2 for? What kinds of energy do we need? How much energy do  
3 we need? These should be projected for both long-term and  
4 short-term needs, and should include all energy sources,  
5 not just electricity.

6 Then we need to consider all energy alternatives  
7 to supply our energy needs. What combination of energy  
8 sources would best supply our needs? This dam is only one  
9 piece of the puzzle. Before we get too excited about one  
10 piece, we need to look at the entire puzzle. Alternatives  
11 should not be just where to build the dam and how it  
12 should be designed; alternatives need to include all ways  
13 of supplying our power needs, including: Natural gas,  
14 tidal power, geothermal, and wind power. As well as  
15 taking energy efficiency measures.

16 I would like to have it spelled out for me why  
17 this dam would be in our best interests over many other  
18 alternatives. We need a cost/benefit analysis. I want to  
19 see an honest, comprehensive, and realistic analysis of  
20 the costs versus the benefits of various energy  
21 alternatives. This analysis should consider ways to  
22 supply both the long- and short-term needs; and it needs  
23 to be presented in a manner that I can understand.

24 After the overall analysis, we need specifics for  
25 the Susitna Dam project. FERC will be looking at the cost

1 of the Susitna project. This information and analysis  
2 needs to be accurate. Where exactly is the money going to  
3 come from? Who's going to profit from this project?  
4 These kinds of projects are notorious for cost overruns.  
5 I'm concerned that cost estimates will include only the  
6 cost of construction, and will ignore a variety of other  
7 expenses.

8 As a taxpayer, I don't want my money going for a  
9 white elephant. I'm almost finished. It brings us to the  
10 environmental costs. What are they? And what makes us  
11 think this dam is worth the inevitable -- inevitable  
12 damages? This is the hard part. I've seen my share my  
13 EISs. The name of the game is to break a natural  
14 environment up into dozens of individual elements; trees,  
15 fish, geology, et cetera. Then we study them and try to  
16 figure -- try to guess how a construction project will  
17 affect them.

18 The bottom line is, that is always an  
19 oversimplification. The Susitna River is an incredibly  
20 complex interwoven system. We throw around terms like, no  
21 significant impact, mitigation, and restoration; but by  
22 the time things go wrong, it's too late; the damage is  
23 already done. In the Lower 48, dams are being torn out;  
24 and people have realized that the damage they do is  
25 significant and can't be easily fixed. We should learn

1 from the mistakes of others.

2 We need to realize that this dam, and the  
3 destruction -- disruption of the river ecosystem below the  
4 dam, would have an inevitable environmental cost. Not  
5 only to the fish; the animals, plants, birds, and bugs;  
6 but also to those of us who work on the river, paddle our  
7 boats on it, travel on it, eat fish from it, paint  
8 pictures of it, write songs about it, and gaze at sunsets  
9 across it.

10 We can do all the studies in the world, but at  
11 what point does the cost become too high? Those of us who  
12 live here are the ones who will really pay the costs when  
13 our wild river's taken away from us. So the question to  
14 ask about this project is, not how should the dam be built  
15 with the least amount of impact; the question is, whether  
16 we should even build this dam at all. I think we  
17 seriously need to consider the alternatives and the  
18 consequences, and the answer will be a resounding no.  
19 Thank you for listening.

20 MR. TURNER: I apologize. I skipped over  
21 somebody else. Rebecca Long.

22 MS. LONG: Oh, I'd let you know. The first thing  
23 that came to my mind when I thought about testimony for  
24 the FERC thing is, is that I really don't think that the  
25 FERC staff who live in the Washington, D.C. Beltway really

1 have, you know, an accurate picture -- or they really  
2 don't understand how much of the bountiful, natural  
3 resources of the Susitna River watershed; that how much  
4 they are a part of our lives. And any threat to those  
5 resources we take very seriously.

6 Even if I don't hunt or if I don't fish, when I  
7 go to work, I know somebody who will give me some salmon  
8 that they caught at Birch Creek or up at Clear Creek or  
9 whatever -- or I can get moose from people. We all  
10 partake of it in some way. I can guarantee you, you ask  
11 anybody and they -- they'll -- somehow they're subsisting,  
12 and they love it; and they love the fact that we can do  
13 that with our resources.

14 For the record, I'm opposed to this proposed dam;  
15 just like I was opposed to its first incarnation in the  
16 1980s. I have a real problem with the integrated  
17 licensing that FERC and AEA have chosen to use. The IOP  
18 process is running society red. By society, I mean the  
19 public, State, and federal resource agencies, and  
20 nongovernmental organizations. It is causing a lot of  
21 stress and strain on government budgets. And the fast  
22 pace is hard on the public.

23 There must be adequate studies on the tributaries  
24 of the Susitna River. I'm a 31-year resident of the  
25 Talkeetna River watershed, and it is a major producer of

1 salmon. I am concerned about impacts to the salmon  
2 fisheries in Clear Creek, Larson Creek, and all up and  
3 down different tributaries. Studies for the licensing  
4 process must be five to seven years; the lifetime of a  
5 chinook salmon.

6 The cost and the mechanism of decommissioning the  
7 dam must be considered. Catastrophic dam failures, asides  
8 being evaluated for actual risk, must look at how that  
9 will affect downstream homeowner's insurance, stuff like  
10 flood insurance. There must be an intricate study of the  
11 cost, both with and without the State subsidies, along  
12 with finance charges and interest rates; this must occur.

13 There must be enough -- there must be a thorough  
14 analysis of other Railbelt energy alternatives. The  
15 Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation must  
16 exercise its 401 Clean Water Act authority. I support the  
17 extension of the scoping public comment period. There  
18 must be a thorough analysis of cumulative impacts of  
19 climate change, methyl mercury that bioaccumulates in fish  
20 after a dam is built, and methane in the reservoir water,  
21 which is caused by inundated rotting vegetation when the  
22 reservoir is in existence.

23 The State -- to issue a fluctuating winter water  
24 levels on humans, aquatic life, and wildlife is very  
25 important to study. Something that nobody has really

1 talked about, is when you have a major development like  
2 this, you're going to have plants that are called noxious  
3 or invasive plants, and as we have seen in other places,  
4 people are going to want to spray herbicides to control  
5 these noxious and invasive plants. I do not want to see  
6 herbicides used here, and this needs to be studied and  
7 mentioned.

8 The EIS needs to be for the full range of dam  
9 heights -- dam heights, for 700 feet to 880 feet, because  
10 880 feet has been talked about in the Legislature. And  
11 finally, we need to study, do we even need this dam.

12 MR. TURNER: Thank you. David Krompacky.

13 MR. KROMPACKY: Yeah, my name's David Krompacky.  
14 42-year resident of Talkeetna. I'm opposed to this.  
15 Selfish reasons to start with. I own property in  
16 Chulitna. My parents have paid taxes on it; I pay the  
17 taxes on it, it's mine. You're going to take and put your  
18 route right through my property, out to Portage Creek,  
19 where my Great Uncle Bill built his first cabin in 1949.  
20 So yeah, I don't want it; the people that -- at Gold  
21 Creek, I haven't seen anyone say, "What are you gonna do  
22 to the people that you're taking their private property,  
23 that they recreate at and own?" You're going to move in  
24 there and take. So that's the first thing really gets me  
25 going.

1           Howard hit on it, water level, ice in the river;  
2 they're gonna drain your lake all winter long. How many  
3 snow machiners? How many caribou, moose you're going to  
4 kill? You can do all the studies you want, but we won't  
5 know until it actually happens, what's going to happen.  
6 None of you guys are gonna be there to answer for it  
7 either; all the people that are working on it. Frivolous  
8 costs that are wasted on all this.

9           All the money that's spent on these studies back  
10 in the '80s, crap that's left out there in the woods; you  
11 got -- the last guys left; you're gonna do it again. All  
12 that money. Why don't you buy some diesel fuel, why don't  
13 you go to Healy, get that coal plant fired up. Start  
14 doing some real economic relief for people in this state.  
15 You're gonna spend this money, it's just going to be  
16 poured away; light the hundred dollars on fire.

17           So what's the real cost? You're telling me,  
18 what, 4 billion? It's in your paperwork. How come on the  
19 Web site I see 24, 26 billion, 2009 dollars. That's when  
20 diesel fuel was 2.80 a gallon. Go look at the pumps; 4.80  
21 -- 4.40 a gallon right now. Just putting it out there. I  
22 don't know.

23           And the last thing, anybody that's working on  
24 this collecting a check, I'm disgusted. I'm disgusted  
25 with the State of Alaska. The day you come to take my

1 property, you tell Governor Parnell to come. I don't need  
2 anymore minutes. He can look me in the eye and try taking  
3 it. That's all I got to say.

4 MR. TURNER: Rick Horstmann.

5 MR. HORSTMANN: Hi, thank you. I'm Rick  
6 Horstmann. I live at Montana Creek. And, yes, I'm very  
7 much against the dam; I want to go on record against it.  
8 You know, I've been listening, I've been following along  
9 and studying, I've really listened to the interview you  
10 did on Susitna on the radio, talking about it awhile back  
11 and have been reading in the newspapers.

12 And then sitting here tonight, I mean, I've just  
13 become more against it. You know, the cost versus the  
14 rewards just seem totally -- totally out of line. The  
15 impacts on the wildlife in the environment will just --  
16 seem unreasonable. But -- and also the risk to safety. I  
17 mean, you know, the diasters we just watched on TV. And  
18 just if there's any chance of that, you know, and the  
19 studies are being rushed.

20 An observation for me is that you keep saying --  
21 I keep hearing that you're looking at the decisions. I --  
22 you know, listening and watching it in the papers and all  
23 and listening to you on the radio, sir, it's real, real  
24 hard not to feel like you've already made all the  
25 decisions. And it really, really seems like everyone

1 sitting here -- your real mandate is to make it happen no  
2 matter what.

3 And, yeah, it's -- you wonder if this process is  
4 -- has any merit at all. Because I'm not -- I don't get  
5 the impression we're really being listened to. And we had  
6 one song tonight, maybe another song for the people who  
7 are doing this and not listening would be something about  
8 "sold my soul." Thanks.

9 MR. TURNER: Pam Robinson.

10 MS. ROBINSON: Hi, my name is Pam Robinson. I'm  
11 a citizen of the Upper Susitna Valley. And I thank you  
12 for being here this evening. I don't think I can speak  
13 any more elegantly than those that have gone before me. I  
14 just hope that you all take note of some of the excellent  
15 suggestions in terms of studies that were made by Greg and  
16 others.

17 I would also mention on behalf of my husband, a  
18 comment that he made, but he's not able to be here  
19 tonight, when you're thinking about moose, they do use the  
20 rivers. And I've heard comments that -- talking about the  
21 lake level falling from the different water levels. I  
22 would also wonder about the rivers and how they'll impact  
23 those populations. I want to thank Art Wettan for  
24 speaking his piece here, kind of going against the  
25 current, swimming upstream here in general.

1           But I would like to say that, even though the  
2 water may be free; the dam will not be. And I think the  
3 estimates of the cost are just scratching the surface. I  
4 think as you look at the Columbia and what's happened down  
5 in your neck of the woods, for those of you that are from  
6 the Oregon area, building the dam is only the beginning.  
7 You have cost overruns, you have -- you know, whatever you  
8 need to do to stop the little fry that aren't going to be  
9 able to make it on their own. And that project doesn't  
10 look like it went very well, and costs just keep going up.

11           It does seem -- it's hard not be a little  
12 jaundice about this process. Like we want to have things  
13 in black and white; what studies should we do. This isn't  
14 a black-and-white issue; it's not even gray; it's  
15 Technicolor. If you get out in that country, it's  
16 beautiful. And to put a dam in it will be devastating to  
17 a lot of people and to the country, which is the most  
18 important thing. Thank you.

19           MR. TURNER: Thank you. Mark Burcar.

20           MR. BURCAR: I'd just like to say something about  
21 studies. When I was in high school, I took a chemistry  
22 course; I was interested in it. I studied for two weeks  
23 every night at the table; my dad watched me study. I  
24 thought I had the answers. Day after the test I came home  
25 and showed my dad my score. And he said, "How'd you get

1 an F? You were studying." I said, "Dad, I don't know.  
2 Maybe there was something more to it that I didn't get.  
3 Maybe there was some variables that I overlooked." So  
4 today I'm not a chemist.

5 And I have another question: Is it comparative  
6 studies we're going to do? Are we going to compare all  
7 the other rivers that run from glacier to ocean that have  
8 been dammed? How many are there? I have some  
9 experiments. A lot of folks in this room have crossed  
10 glacial rivers. I can tell you that crossing a glacial  
11 river that is 2.8 feet deep is a difficult thing to do.

12 I propose we could experiment. We could put all  
13 of you in a raft, drop you off on a gravel bar in the  
14 middle of Su; beautiful, dry gravel bar. Mind you, it is  
15 only 1-and-a-half feet above water level. I can row away,  
16 and you can pretend that you just woke up and your raft  
17 was gone; you could pretend that you are frightened and  
18 you didn't know how to get home. But you knew how you got  
19 there.

20 We could say, get in your tents, and then in the  
21 middle of the night we could drag you out into the river.  
22 Oh, just about 2.8 feet deep. We could experiment to see  
23 how well that would go. Studies. My dad watched me  
24 study. He said, "I know you studied; I saw you do it  
25 every night for two weeks." Well, we're not going to be

1 able to come out and make sure you're studying. I don't  
2 even think you possibly have any idea all the things you  
3 could study.

4 How about -- I don't know, three to six times a  
5 year I get on the train to Gold -- oh, Gold Creek, where  
6 it's affected the most. I dump my raft off, and we float  
7 down the river. We know that the high pick rush of spring  
8 has left, so we go through the back channels and all the  
9 little pools. We see these little insects. I'm like,  
10 wow, moving -- those are sticks. Oh, no, that's a tiny  
11 insect that takes shelter in a stick to hide from  
12 something. Why? Because something's preying on it.

13 That is a tiny little insect that I don't even  
14 know the name of. Do you? Are you going to tell me  
15 what's going to happen when the -- repeatedly you wash  
16 through all those little stagnant pools that grow little  
17 tiny things, the very basis of life? So, yes, we can  
18 study; and I believe you will study.

19 MR. TURNER: Thank you. Whitney Wolf.

20 MS. WOLF: Thanks. My name's Whitney Wolf. I've  
21 been a resident of Talkeetna for 23 years. I'm a small  
22 business owner, and I serve on the Community Council here;  
23 but tonight I'll be speaking as a concerned citizen. I  
24 want to remind all of you guys, that you are determining  
25 the factor of the largest project to ever hit the state in

1 the history. The most expensive State-subsidized project,  
2 and it's a big deal.

3 And some of you from the Commission, I know,  
4 David, you were here for the August meeting in Talkeetna  
5 in the Sheldon Hangar. It was pretty clear then that the  
6 community had a lot of unanswered questions. And at that  
7 time, the agencies were also here for the site visit. And  
8 it was pretty clear that they also had a lot of concerns  
9 with the IOP licensing process.

10 These agencies, along with NGOs, and  
11 stakeholders, the general public, all contacted your  
12 agency, FERC -- to express their doubts that the IOP  
13 process could provide a licensing framework, which would  
14 retain any credibility for a project of this magnitude.  
15 But here we are today, embarked on the IOP process  
16 nonetheless. Even after the PAD was submitted  
17 December 29th, the same unanswered questions remain.

18 Critical details of the project are still  
19 elusive. When you cited, we're not sure how high the  
20 dam's going to be; that's going to affect the length of  
21 the reservoir. We're not sure what access corridors we  
22 have yet. So these still haven't been answered in the  
23 PAD, or in the scoping document, neither one. And each  
24 time we have these undetermined operations, such as Wayne  
25 was mentioning between whether we're going to do load

1 following or base loading, we have a whole other set of  
2 unknowns; and a whole other set of studies that need to be  
3 done.

4 So this presents a problem for all the research  
5 agencies. Each one of these undetermined details affects  
6 those agencies and how they can adequately present their  
7 study requests in these areas they are in charge of  
8 mandatory conditioning. How can they study the in-stream  
9 flows, if they don't know the dam size? How can they know  
10 what the operational regimes are going to be if they  
11 haven't been confirmed?

12 The understaffed and the underfunded agencies who  
13 made it clear that the scope of the project and the  
14 complexity of the watershed, is just too vast to be  
15 encompassed in these two years. I attended the January  
16 resource agency meetings, and I was alarmed at how science  
17 is flaxy to speed on this FERC process. AEA did a good  
18 job; they opened up and introduced the PAD. And -- but  
19 they set a tone, and that speed was the number-one thing  
20 on the agenda.

21 And I quote, they came in and said, "We're  
22 hitting the ground running. We're running and we're  
23 running hard. We're scrambling." And the agencies  
24 answered back, we're pulling our hair out trying to get  
25 these studies done; trying to get our study requests in on

1 the same day that the PAD comments are due on the day that  
2 Scoping Document 1 comments are due. And that's alarming,  
3 okay; that's not the environment that this size of a  
4 project deserves; and I would urge you guys to continue  
5 to, you know, engage in these requests that the agencies  
6 are asking for extensions.

7           Quickly, I know my time's up. But missing areas  
8 of the -- in the scoping document, the socioeconomics; I  
9 know you're in charge of that, is missing the tourism  
10 angle altogether. You could site the ATIT recent poll on  
11 why people come to the state. Wild land was the number  
12 reason they came; followed by scenery and wildlife. So  
13 we'll submit that in writing. Also the -- the winter  
14 recreation is weak as well, and I urge you to really  
15 consider the consequences of this reckless experiment.  
16 Thank you.

17           MR. TURNER: Mary Ostermick.

18           MS. OSTERMICK: Hi, my name is Mary Ostermick.  
19 And I'm here because I've lived in the area for over  
20 30 years between Talkeetna and north of there. I'm  
21 definitely opposed to this. I think people have presented  
22 wonderful thoughts tonight, nothing that I could top; but  
23 I do want to be on record as saying that I'm opposed to  
24 it.

25           Two of my biggest concerns have to do with the --

1 the earthquake possibility; that's huge. And that's not  
2 something that can be controlled or built strongly enough.  
3 There's just way too many unknowns. And the other thing  
4 I'm really concerned about is just in general, the  
5 watershed, the natural areas, the habitat, that would be  
6 destroyed, that is absolutely what we have here that's so  
7 special. Change can be okay; but change with destruction,  
8 with so many unknowns, is not acceptable. And certainly  
9 something that deserves people to speak out against.  
10 Thank you.

11 MR. TURNER: Thank you. Robert Gerlach.

12 MR. GERLACH: I'd like to apologize to the  
13 audience, because I'm probably gonna go over. And I think  
14 it's a big oversight on FERC and AEA, you know how much  
15 opposition was going to be in this community and  
16 controversy; and I think you scheduled way too short a  
17 period to cover it.

18 My name's Robert Gerlach. I've lived in  
19 Talkeetna about 39 years. I have a house downtown, in the  
20 downtown area of Talkeetna, and a cabin probably 15 miles  
21 up the Susitna. And two other parcels that are out of the  
22 floodplain, and not in real danger from the dam; but they  
23 still will be impacted. I meant to say I'm here as a  
24 private citizen, you know, even though I serve on the  
25 Talkeetna Community Council.

1           I use the river corridor for transportation, both  
2 summer and winter. Fish, hunt the area, and I have major  
3 concerns about the proposed Susitna-Watana project. I'm  
4 going to go into a little bit of history. About 7:30 a.m.  
5 on June 5th, 1976 the under-construction Teton Dam was  
6 filling. A wet spot was noticed on the downstream face.  
7 The dam was being built on the Teton River, and southeast  
8 at Idaho by the Bureau of Reclamation, which had built  
9 hundreds, hundreds of dams.

10           I looked on the Web site today, and I could not  
11 even count all the dams that they have built; very  
12 experienced dam builder. The stow way had not yet been  
13 finished, and the dam was almost filled; filling at a rate  
14 of about 4 feet a day; it had been planned to be filled at  
15 a rate about 1 foot a day, but with the construction  
16 unfinished on the spillway, they weren't able to spill  
17 water over it.

18           The Bureau of Reclamation had successfully built  
19 hundreds of dams as I said, and no one was worried; there  
20 was no reason to worry. The mighty Bureau would have  
21 scoffed at suggestions that anything catastrophic could  
22 happen. The leak worsened, and despite attempts to fill  
23 it with heavy equipment, at 11:55 a.m., the dam  
24 catastrophically collapsed, destroying four down --  
25 communities downstream, with 14 deaths, billions of

1 dollars of damages.

2 Alaska Energy Authority has built a handful of  
3 dams. I've looked on your Web site, and looked around,  
4 and I believe to say a dozen would be generous, most  
5 likely about half of that. I can count six. They are  
6 mostly lake cap dams. And AEA, unlike the Bureau of  
7 Reclamation, has no experience in major river dam  
8 construction to my knowledge. Alaska Energy Authority is  
9 before FERC now, applying for a license to build a much  
10 larger dam than the Teton on the Susitna River.

11 And when questioned about the prospect of  
12 catastrophic dam failure, AEA pretty much scoffs at any  
13 such questions, just like the Bureau of Reclamation would  
14 have about the Teton Dam. It can't happen here. But it  
15 did happen there, only 35 years ago; that's not ancient  
16 history. But unlike the Teton Dam, the proposed  
17 Susitna-Watana Dam is being built in a very active seismic  
18 area. 10 years ago a 9 --- a 7.9 earthquake occurred in  
19 the Denali Fault, which is about 40 miles from the  
20 proposed dam site.

21 Who knows how severe an earthquake is possible.  
22 Tokyo Power Company assured Japan that the Fukushima Power  
23 Plant was invincible. Assurances are very cheap. Alaska  
24 Energy Authority wants to fast-track this project and  
25 complete the studies of this proposed dam after dam

1 construction has begun. Having seen the results of other  
2 projects, AEA and AEA's financing agency, AIDEA, have  
3 done, such as the Healy Clean Coal Plant, there's no way  
4 any work should be started until the studies FERC mandates  
5 are completed. To do so otherwise would be like giving a  
6 teenager that is reluctant to do his homework, the keys to  
7 a shiny new high-performance car and expect him to go do  
8 their homework. It just ain't gonna happen.

9 MR. TURNER: Can you wrap up, please?

10 MR. GERLACH: On February -- on February 10th,  
11 2012, Wayne Dyok, on our local radio station, KTNA  
12 program, Susitna Valley Voice, as much said that nothing  
13 -- as much as said, that nothing will stop AEA from  
14 building this dam. So it doesn't matter to AEA what the  
15 studies reveal, it doesn't to matter to AEA what the  
16 economics of the project are, the environmental impacts  
17 are irrelevant.

18 The only thing in the way of construction right  
19 or wrong -- in the way of construction right or wrong, is  
20 FERC approval. The Healy Coal -- the Healy Clean Coal  
21 project was built with AIDEA financing, cost a third of a  
22 billion dollars, was a fast-track project. Why should  
23 anyone worry about it? Money came from the feds. No  
24 power sales agreements were signed before construction,  
25 has sat idle for over 10 years while the power co-ops,

1 AIDEA, and others involved, argue over cost of the power  
2 and who was going to pay for it.

3 50 megawatts of potential power that has sat for  
4 over 10 years, has cost over a million dollars a year to  
5 keep the plant in warm storage without a watt of usable  
6 energy being produced. Recently AIDEA announced that the  
7 plant would be sold to Golden Valley 50 million, with a  
8 \$45 million loan to get it operational. So AIDEA gave a  
9 -- approximately \$328 million plant, and \$45 million to  
10 get it started for a promise of \$50 million in the future.  
11 No one was held accountable.

12 Everybody is still in their jobs, and it's going  
13 on. And that's how -- the way AIDEA seems to do business,  
14 and also AEA. Why should anyone -- why should anyone  
15 worry about the cost of the Susitna-Watana project? That  
16 is on oil money, just like Healy was federal money; it  
17 didn't come out of our pockets. The AEA's best guess of  
18 the cost of what Susitna-Watana is is about \$4-and-a-half  
19 billion; that does not include the access road; the  
20 proposed 8,000-foot runway. We only have a 35-foot runway  
21 here in Talkeetna.

22 Power plant transmission lines, mitigation of  
23 negative effects and land acquisition; it's also worth  
24 noting that much of the land belongs to Native landowners,  
25 regional and village corporations, who are not going to

1 give the land away; that's another cause. Given a history  
2 of a low foot-in-the-door estimate on their projects, the  
3 dam and other costs are likely to approach 7 to 10  
4 billion.

5 The Willow-Healy inter-tie, first proposed for  
6 \$76 million by APA, the same -- same birds in the same  
7 cage -- caught -- first proposed for \$76 million; before  
8 the ink was even dry on the appropriation for 76 million,  
9 the cost went up, and latest estimate I read, was in --  
10 just a few months ago, in -- Magazine, and it said it cost  
11 125 million; which is a 66 percent overrun approximately.

12 The World Commission on Dams, in a 2002 report,  
13 reports average overruns at a cost of building large dams  
14 as 50 percent. If one takes the cost of these mega  
15 projects and divides by the number of people the project  
16 served, the cost per user is astronomical. AEA has  
17 already contracted a half a million dollars to a public  
18 relations firm to sell the project in its more favorable  
19 light. The Legislature has appropriated 76 -- \$67 million  
20 to get started, just to the State agencies involved.

21 It's a done deal, except for the minor matter of  
22 FERC licensing; which we're speaking to you about tonight.  
23 The reason, and I call it reason, since the oil money  
24 flowed in, state history is awash in large-dollar  
25 doomboggle -- boondoggle projects by State agencies. As

1 the oil money rushes in, projects are proposed and funded  
2 without proper scrutiny. The proposed Susitna project has  
3 to have tremendous impact on the resources of the Susitna  
4 Basin.

5 The fish and river are sure to -- have impacts  
6 load falling water outlet. Each day the water body will  
7 increase, just like the road increases. Increased flow is  
8 estimated to be up almost a hundred percent at the river  
9 mouth, to 400 percent upriver from Talkeetna. The low  
10 river is used for boating in the summer; and winter, snow  
11 machine travel. Will the river be safe for boating in the  
12 summer? What happens to ice formation as the level  
13 fluctuates?

14 The western -- the Alaska ENR has sold hundreds  
15 and hundreds of land parcels across the Susitna River on  
16 the westside. Most of these people access them by snow  
17 machine in the winter. What's going to happen to the ice  
18 formation there? Are they -- these people gonna be able  
19 to access their cabins? Wildlife is abundant both on the  
20 lower and upper river area, as well as the area that we  
21 impounded by the dam.

22 This is a tremendous resource used by many  
23 Alaskans. Both sport and commercial fish use of fish  
24 resources, both residential and anadromous fish will be  
25 affected. Not those just above the dam site. The value

1 of this resources is tremendous. This will be given up  
2 for a dam producing about 300 megawatts average. This is  
3 not only -- this will only supply a portion of electric  
4 power needs and will not supply enough power for space  
5 heating, and that is why the money spent should -- would  
6 be much more wisely used in developing the state's natural  
7 gas potential.

8 I have absolutely no faith in Alaska Power  
9 Authority to perform the studies in an unbiased, objective  
10 manner. It will be up to you to make sure that he does  
11 his job. No one else is gonna do it. I can't do. I  
12 don't have the money; I don't have the personal resources.  
13 These people don't have the personal resources. The  
14 current State administration has just about declared war  
15 on all species of fish in the quest to develop resources.

16 And in the Pacific Northwest, I wish I could say  
17 the salmon resources were decimated. The definition of  
18 decimation is reduced by 10 percent. Well, we'd be lucky  
19 -- lucky if there's 10 percent of those fish left; not 10  
20 percent reduced. When these impacts begin showing up,  
21 these AEA people will be long gone. If the proposed dam  
22 is built, and online, I will be my in 70s.

23 I live in downtown Talkeetna. I don't want to  
24 have to get up and run to high ground, wondering if I will  
25 lose everything I have and worked for all my life and cost

1 my life every time we have an earthquake. And I wondered,  
2 what's happening up at the dam. AEA seems to duck serious  
3 questions about this dam. For us living in a flood area,  
4 the proposed dam -- catastrophic dam failure, we need to  
5 know where the safe ground is.

6 FERC needs to have these answers in front of  
7 them, and make clear -- make a clear, objective decision  
8 on whether this proposed dam makes sense. AEA is not  
9 qualified or honest enough to make decisions of this  
10 magnitude. I know a lot of this has been repeated. I'm  
11 sorry to have taken so much of your audience's time. But  
12 I think it's something that needed to be heard.

13 MR. TURNER: Again, I'd like to ask everybody to  
14 hold their comments to three minutes. Once we get through  
15 everybody and there's additional time left, we'll turn it  
16 back over -- the floor to you. But I want to make sure  
17 that everyone gets a chance to talk to, express your  
18 opinions and your thoughts and comments. So the next  
19 person I've got is Cary Birdsall.

20 MR. BIRDSALL: Thank you. First of all I'm just  
21 curious, is there anybody who's upset with these  
22 individuals who've taken extra time tonight? Okay. So  
23 that leaves you guys. So if you have a problem with it,  
24 you need to state that; but we're fine. Thanks for coming  
25 up, really appreciate it. There's little doubt that this

1 dam can be build. The big question is: Why do we want  
2 to?

3 In the end, building the dam would be  
4 comparatively easy. The work won't be easy. And there  
5 would be major physical and political obstacles and  
6 cultural considerations, but it would all be focused in  
7 one direction. One project, one budget; get 'er done.  
8 Unfortunately, the best answer to our energy needs is not  
9 the simplest one. When you weigh the benefits against the  
10 liabilities and consider the alternatives, I believe  
11 you'll agree.

12 Also, unfortunately, the Alaska State Legislature  
13 and Governor agree, they have commissioned the Alaska  
14 Energy Authority to get 'er done. I want to briefly  
15 address the wisdom of this project and the alternatives to  
16 it. I came to this state in 1971, thinking that here was  
17 a place, just getting started, that could benefit from the  
18 lessons learned in other parts of the country, that have  
19 already faced similar problems and opportunities. Then I  
20 learned, that we don't give a damn how they do it Outside.  
21 There's a joke there, but I won't go there.

22 And obviously we still don't give a damn how they  
23 do it Outside. While no other state has built a dam of  
24 this magnitude in over 50 years, and while some are  
25 decommissioning what they have, we are planning to build

1 one. A big one. I took a look at some recent and pending  
2 hydro projects in the Lower 48. I found scale dams of 12  
3 to 23 feet, lumber river projects and tidal power  
4 projects.

5 The only references I found to large-scale dams,  
6 were plans to decommission them. I think FERC's own  
7 experience have shown that big dams are not the way to go.  
8 The majority of people in this room are in favor of  
9 alternative energy, and a good number of them are  
10 presently using it. But before they invested in that  
11 infrastructure, they were advised to make sure their  
12 houses could use energy efficiently.

13 For a comparatively small expenditure, the State  
14 could save 20 to 30 percent in Energy costs by continuing  
15 and extending its weatherization programs. Other  
16 alternative energy programs could be brought online as  
17 they become available, including solar, wind, small hydro,  
18 and geothermal. Meanwhile, the State has a huge amount of  
19 natural gas which belongs to the people of this state.  
20 Making this gas available for the people of Alaska, would  
21 provide a temporary energy source while we can craft a  
22 sensible sustainable long-term energy policy for our  
23 state. Thank you.

24 MR. TURNER: Next person is Ruth Wood.

25 MS. WOOD: I was out enjoining Alaska today. But

1 I'm here now. My name is Ruth Wood, and I live in  
2 Talkeetna. I'm a recreational musher, and that's what I  
3 was doing today. And I eat a lot of salmon. I oppose the  
4 proposed Susitna hydro project, but I'm not a scientist.  
5 I cannot design the study. I cannot do what you say.

6 "You should include an explanation of why the  
7 study is needed. Along with study's goals and objectives.  
8 Public interest considerations, any gaps in existing  
9 experience that the study will fill, an explanation of how  
10 the study is connected to project operations or effects,  
11 study methodology, and the level of effort and the cost of  
12 conducting the request study." I cannot do that.

13 But that's your job is to make sure those studies  
14 get done. And what I can do, is give you just a few  
15 thoughts. And I hope I'm going to have some written ones  
16 that -- are more -- but I don't think the IOP process was  
17 designed to address this kind of a mega project. It was  
18 designed to address relicensing of dams. There are things  
19 about it that are good, but a compressed time line is not  
20 going to work. Ecosystems take years to study, especially  
21 where there's no baseline data.

22 I don't know which of these studies don't have  
23 baseline data; but I guarantee you, a lot of them don't.  
24 Please adjust your time requirements to allow adequate  
25 time to design and conduct studies. You have the power to

1 change that time line. And if you don't do it, it is a  
2 travesty. The Susitna River is a transportation corridor.  
3 From my perspective, this is especially true in winter. I  
4 used to live in Chugiak, which is just a little bit north  
5 of Anchorage. Eagle River, Chugiak. And I used to mush a  
6 lot from Willow.

7 And from Willow you go out on the Susitna River  
8 and you cross over to the Yentna River. In fact, an area  
9 so many of us know, is the Iditarod Trail uses the Susitna  
10 River. If you have these -- CFSs in winter, the Iditarod  
11 may not be starting in Willow anymore; it may have to go  
12 up to Nenana because those dog teams cannot go on unstable  
13 shelf ice. I'm hurrying. I thought this was going to be  
14 three minutes.

15 Anyway, a year or two of data is not sufficient.  
16 I have -- I moved to Alaska in 1990. There have not been  
17 two winters that were exactly the same. You could  
18 probably group them into study areas. But they're not --  
19 winter's different every single year up here. And one or  
20 two years of study is not going to do the trick. Now, AEA  
21 keep saying that there are not many kings above the  
22 proposed dam site. But I'm worried about the kings, the  
23 reds, the silvers below the dam site, all the way to Cook  
24 Inlet.

25 These varies -- variants, and flows, the changes

1 in sedimentation, the changes in temperature, will affect  
2 the fish from egg to fry to adult spawning fish streams.  
3 It will affect the side streams. AEA says warmer  
4 temperatures will be good for the eggs. But will it be  
5 good for insects, for invertebrates. Once those little  
6 salmon hatch, they have to eat. What will happen to  
7 Alexander Creek and Lake Creek off the Yentna River?

8 Nobody -- none of these maps look at the whole  
9 system. And I was going to bring one tonight, but I  
10 didn't have time to get it together. But you have to look  
11 at the whole system. The Yentna River is huge. And if  
12 you affect downstream of where the Susitna and the Yentna  
13 come together, you are really going to do some damage.  
14 Okay. I just learned that on the Columbia River system,  
15 they're spending about a billion dollars a year. A  
16 billion dollars a year. To try to restore the salmon.

17 Who is gonna commit to spending that to restore  
18 the Susitna River? Who is going to enforce that  
19 commitment, a billion dollars a year? Okay. 4.3 billion  
20 project cost. But, you know, I really want to look at  
21 those project costs. And I just -- just asked over the  
22 weekend, hey, you know, ever since February, AEA's been  
23 saying the best guess is 4.3 million. And I said, I don't  
24 really -- I've been looking on the Web site, I cannot find  
25 that study.

1           And I got an e-mail back, and it said, oh, well  
2           there's not another study, it's just a more detailed cost  
3           analysis or the level for engineering estimate. How can  
4           we as citizens of Alaska evaluate this project cost if we  
5           can't even get the reports? The other thing is, why isn't  
6           there a citizens' advisory board in this project? I think  
7           FERC has used some kind of citizen groups on some sort of  
8           licensing processes. I'd like to see it on this.

9           I'd like to see -- people have already said  
10          catastrophic dam failure, so I won't mention that. The  
11          other thing is, EISSs have to have a no-build alternative;  
12          and I really hope we will see one in this one. And the  
13          other thing is, I would like to know, has FERC ever not  
14          given a license? Yeah, I mean, you are in the business.  
15          And I hope that what we're doing here tonight is  
16          worthwhile, because I'm going to be 75 lying in front of  
17          the bulldozers.

18                 MR. TURNER: Cathy Teich.

19                 MS. TEICH: My name's Cathy Teich. And I'm a  
20          resident here. And I really think that we've been given  
21          sort of the ramrod deal here, maybe the Governor had a  
22          buddy who want to a build a dam. It's funny to me that  
23          all the legislators, without exception practically, would  
24          agree that, oh, yes, we should do it. A lot of people  
25          that I know around the state have -- were unaware that

1 this was even coming up.

2 And now that it is starting to be more  
3 publicized, people are in shock. I think that we haven't  
4 been given a fair public process. And as -- I think  
5 that's one of -- one of the things of our country, our  
6 democracy, that we're supposed to have input; and we're  
7 supposed to have true input, instead of lip service and  
8 just something to placate us. Because I kind of think  
9 that is happening.

10 And it is -- it is really not fair. And it's  
11 probably not the best option -- let it go on record that  
12 I'm extremely opposed to this dam. It will be a travesty  
13 for the wilderness, for the river, for the fish, for  
14 everyone that lives here, for our safety in the event of a  
15 failure. And the studies haven't been adequately  
16 addressed, any of them. And I just think that the -- AEA  
17 was supposed to come up with -- let's see, we were  
18 supposed to look at energy alternatives. So I ask, where  
19 are the other alternatives?

20 All I hear about from AEA is the dam. Like it's  
21 a done deal. It kind of disturbs me that we're talking  
22 licensing up here, when we're still trying to determine  
23 what is the best route. And so I think that -- that maybe  
24 we need to talk about more alternatives. However much  
25 money is going to be spent on these -- these studies, I

1 really begin to think that maybe if we divvied up all that  
2 money and did a little -- you know, like, you could almost  
3 give Alaska's alternative systems and do better than what  
4 we're doing.

5 This thing could have bankrupt this State. And  
6 as a taxpayer, I'm nauseated that this is even being  
7 talked about. And I -- I don't think a licence should be  
8 granted. Thank you.

9 MR. TURNER: Thank you. Tom Waite.

10 MR. WAITE: Okay. Well, very good testimony.  
11 It's been a very entertaining evening. And I hope I'm  
12 gonna entertain you for about three minutes by describing  
13 the area of the -- where -- the valley where the dam would  
14 be. In 1984 I made my first trip down the Susitna River,  
15 going along the Denali Highway -- and just for your  
16 information, about mile 20 is where I usually get my  
17 caribou these days.

18 Anyway, some of the -- the Susitna River, I  
19 forget exactly how many miles it is off the -- the Parks  
20 Highway, but not a whole -- a whole great distance. But  
21 we put in -- we put in there at the bridge at the river  
22 there, and we floated down for a full day or so. It's a  
23 real slow river at that point, really -- really flat or  
24 windy around and slow river. Wind took charge of our  
25 bullet for a while.

1           And -- but when we got down to the -- Oshetna of  
2       course is at the -- or not to the Oshetna, to the McLaren,  
3       things had tightened up a bit, little bit smaller river,  
4       or more confined. Anyway, we saw a lot of moose and we  
5       saw a lot of birds, aquatic birds -- birds, or, you know,  
6       sandpipers. And let's see, yellowlegs, things like that,  
7       harlequin ducks. A lot of different birds up there.

8           And of course this is the area where all the  
9       caribou are seen in the fall, and it's a major subsistence  
10      hunting area in September, October, and later on in the  
11      winter if there's enough caribou. But the time we were  
12      there the caribou are a little further to the south.  
13      Anyway, we -- we camped at the Oshetna, which comes out  
14      with a roar from the east. And the only sign of life we'd  
15      seen at any -- or human activity, we'd seen anywhere along  
16      the way, was right there. We found a little circle of  
17      stones had been there so long that there was moss growing  
18      on them, but nothing else.

19           And then we spent the night there. And the next  
20      day we took off down to -- down the Susitna. Now, up to  
21      that point the river's dropping at about 6 feet a mile.  
22      And after the Oshetna, drops about 12 foot a mile. So you  
23      can imagine, it's quite a change in the river. And as you  
24      get going down that river, it comes up to what they call  
25      on the map Bee Canyon. Well, Bee Canyon is more like a W,

1       shaped like a W. And it really was something that would  
2       make Indiana Jones nervous.

3                You go into that canyon and you're pushed up  
4       against the walls. And you have to fight off the walls.  
5       And back -- the next thing you know you're going another  
6       way, and then back against -- you know, till you're  
7       finally through this thing. And when you get through it,  
8       you're still so high in elevation that you can see down  
9       into the valley. This is the point where you can see into  
10      the valley that would be flooded.

11              And if they build the dam, of course that would  
12      be flooded up to that point. Quite a few miles, because  
13      it took us two days to get down to the -- to the dam site  
14      from there. Of course we're taking our time and we're  
15      looking at the wildlife, the bears and moose and other  
16      things that we saw along the way. And I think I really  
17      wasn't prepared for what I found in that valley.

18              You know, it -- I -- I wanted to see that valley  
19      before a dam overtook it, and that's basically why I did  
20      it. I thought I'd never get a chance to. But once I got  
21      down in there, I discovered that this was not only prime  
22      habitat, but this was a virtual -- law. This is a hidden  
23      valley that you couldn't get to by any convenient means.  
24      And -- because of course, from the other end, it's blocked  
25      by the Devil's Canyon. Which is -- if you ever fly over

1       that thing, there's rocks in there the size of the hotels,  
2       you know, it's scary.

3               But going down through the valley we just saw so  
4       much wildlife. And I think that to -- to Scenic Creek, we  
5       camped there. And caught some grayling there. And I just  
6       had this feeling that when I died, this would be the place  
7       to leave my ashes. I've kind of held that thought all  
8       these years. But if you put a dam there, I guess we can  
9       forget about that. So it's kind of selfish consideration,  
10      but I found a very nice place down there, and I'd like to  
11      keep it that way. Thank you.

12             MR. TURNER: Rollie Ostermick.

13             MR. OSTERMICK: I'm Rollie -- I'm Rollie  
14      Ostermick, I live in the Talkeetna area. I'm totally  
15      against the idea of the Susitna Dam. I'd like to mention  
16      one experience I had that relates to the potential problem  
17      of this dam. I worked for six years in Cap Mine National  
18      Park out in the Alaska Peninsula, in the '70s and '80s.  
19      The main drainage of the park is the Natick River, with 60  
20      plus tributary rivers and streams that make up the  
21      drainage. Fish & Game counts and verify approximately a  
22      million salmon spawning these streams every summer.

23             I spent a lot of time exploring many of these  
24      streams, photographing of the salmon, bears, and eagles on  
25      my days off. One small stream I especially concentrated

1 on, because of the abundance of fish and bears, was only  
2 about a mile long. Over 2,000 fish would spawn in the  
3 lower quarter mile of this stream every summer. This  
4 photo -- this photo is an average day on this stream in  
5 August -- in the beginning of their run.

6 In '95, my wife and I returned to Cap Mine for a  
7 visit. We went to the stream with great excitement, as we  
8 hadn't been back in 12 years. The first time out on the  
9 first day, to our amazement, we only saw 10 sockeye  
10 salmon. The next day, which was the high count, we saw 20  
11 salmon. In frustration on the fourth day, with few fish  
12 spawning we went exploring. About a half a mile upstream  
13 of the ideal -- half a mile upstream of the ideal spawning  
14 gravel, we came on a large beaver dam. 200 feet wide,  
15 holding about 6 feet of water.

16 It was now clear why there was few fish in the  
17 stream. I'm not sure if the problem was -- was the water  
18 was too warm in the summer or in the winter the stream  
19 actually froze to the bottom with the lesser flow, or some  
20 unknown consequence. Last spring or winter, whenever the  
21 public meeting was at the elementary school, one of the  
22 AEA employees mentioned, only about 50 king salmon go  
23 above the Watana Dam site to spawn in the summer. Hence,  
24 there should be little detrimental effect to spawning  
25 salmon on the majority of the Susitna.

1           I hope by now AEA has talked with fisheries  
2 biologists, and realized that this dam will have major  
3 consequences to the salmon downstream of the dam. The  
4 beaver on the dam that my wife and I witnessed, will  
5 eventually run out of feed and move their family to a new  
6 location. It may be 20 to 50 years before the salmon will  
7 -- will build back their population to what it has been,  
8 and eventually these salmon will return.

9           But the dam on the Susitna will never -- with the  
10 dam on the Susitna, the salmon will never be like they are  
11 today, and to think or say otherwise is plain foolish.  
12 Thank you.

13           MR. TURNER: Molly Wood.

14           MS. WOOD: Thank you. Thanks for coming this  
15 evening and thanks for taking my comments. I'm hoping  
16 that I'll touch on a couple of the bullet points in your  
17 slide of the request for information. I'm standing up as  
18 a resident of Chase actually. I live north of the  
19 Talkeetna River, and that makes me actually a Chase  
20 resident. And I'm gonna try to offer, I think some  
21 reflections on two things in particular to supplement some  
22 of the comments that we've heard already this evening,  
23 many of which resonate with me.

24           One is, to just give some specific examples of  
25 how the river is used and the watershed is used, so you

1 can take that into consideration when you think about the  
2 value and assessing impact. And then also some personal  
3 reflections about what's important when we think about how  
4 we weigh those impacts and balance costs and benefits. So  
5 I live at mile 104 on the Susitna River. It's just about  
6 the confluence of the Chulitna River.

7           It is -- we live right on the river, and I am on  
8 the river every single day. Our drinking water is a  
9 25-foot shallow well tributary to the Susitna River. And  
10 the water we drink comes directly from the river, and is  
11 impacted directly by the elevation of the river. We  
12 annually hunt moose along the river. We qualify for  
13 federally recognized subsistence hunting, and annually  
14 exercise that right by harvesting moose and caribou from  
15 the Nelchina herd in the designated areas adjacent to the  
16 proposed dam and reservoir.

17           These are all animals that rely on a healthy  
18 biological corridor along the Upper Susitna River and  
19 northern Talkeetna Mountains. We raft, we fish, we bike,  
20 and we otherwise recreate on and around and through the  
21 river. We fish for silver, kings, burbints, dolly varden,  
22 trout, grayling, et cetera, on the Susitna and its  
23 tributaries. We heat our home with wood, using a  
24 wood-burning stove with wood that's harvested from the  
25 flood-plains of the Susitna River.

1           We built our house from trees logged along the  
2 river. We call them salmon-fed trees. We have a noble  
3 white spruce, 34-inch diameter butt, that forms the sill  
4 log of our home. Everything fundamental to our life  
5 depends on the Susitna River. Our food, our shelter, our  
6 water, our wood heats. I'm not alone, many of my  
7 neighbors are here in this audience, many of whom you've  
8 heard from today. We depend on that river. Here, in  
9 Chase, up the Yentna in Chulitna.

10           Around the proposed development in the middle of  
11 nowhere, I've heard it was referred to in Anchorage  
12 recently, these and other communities rely heavily on a  
13 healthy watershed to sustain our wildlife populations, the  
14 aquatic life, all of that in turn sustains us. They  
15 provide for our health, our way of life, and they sustain  
16 our spirits. These are the public benefits that a  
17 free-flowing river provides for us, and they are the  
18 services -- the ecosystem services that are at risk under  
19 the proposed project.

20           If it goes through, these services should be  
21 included in the cost of the dam. We're also part of a  
22 community that relies heavily on the Susitna River for our  
23 transportation. We heard about that earlier. My husband  
24 and I access our home every day from the frozen river  
25 right now, that's how we get in and out of our home. In

1 the summer, we access it by boat. 2.8 feet will make a  
2 huge difference in our life.

3 We do not have an alternative, there are not  
4 roads north of Talkeetna. To be clear, there also are not  
5 power lines. We will not benefit from this power plant.  
6 Our community does not have an alternative means of  
7 filling the -- at the mouth of the Susitna River either  
8 for our set -- our community members do not have an  
9 alternative means of fertilizing the farthest reaches of  
10 our watershed with spawned-out salmon that support the  
11 forests so that we can have a healthy source of timber,  
12 logs, firewood, migratory bird habitats, et cetera.

13 My understanding is that Fairbanks and Anchorage  
14 have alternative options for sources of power. Another  
15 important factor in evaluating the cost of the dam  
16 relative to the value of the services that this river  
17 provides for us, is the fact that it's free-flowing from  
18 glacier to sea. There's not another dam already on this  
19 river. It is 313 miles long, and it's the first dam that  
20 would stop the natural flow of water.

21 It would change the natural fluctuations that  
22 support five species of salmon, innumerable ecosystem  
23 services that support human populations. In the 1930s  
24 when the federal government began building huge  
25 hydroelectric dams on the Columbia, we didn't understand

1 the impact that those dams would have on the abundant  
2 salmon of the Columbia Basin in the Pacific Northwest. We  
3 know now what those dams have done.

4 We know they're responsible for the decline in  
5 sockeye salmon, steelhead; both of which are now listed as  
6 endangered species. And a billion dollars a year, as Ruth  
7 pointed out earlier, is spent on trying to support  
8 recovery efforts. We know what that cost is. If we had  
9 known that then, would we have licensed the Bonneville  
10 Dam? Have the benefits justified the cost to the public  
11 trust resources? What if we knew then that someday we  
12 would face the collapse of our fisheries throughout the  
13 entire world?

14 Would we still have licensed it? I don't know.  
15 But once that first dam goes on the river, every dam after  
16 it is easier. Every dam after it is just one incremental  
17 impact on our resources. We are not -- excuse me. That's  
18 not the case with this dam. We're not weighing the  
19 ability to generate 300 megawatts of power against the  
20 impact of adding another reservoir to an already  
21 controlled river.

22 It's the first dam, and its legacy will be to  
23 forever change the character of the entire Susitna  
24 watershed, and everything that natural system supports.  
25 The bar should be set much higher to account for the

1 intrinsic value of a healthy watershed that flows free and  
2 wild and supports river -- salmon throughout the river.  
3 Just as you're responsible for assessing the cumulative  
4 impacts of multiple projects in any given area, I urge you  
5 to look carefully at the cumulative benefits of this  
6 entire area.

7 Look at that baseline, and understand the value  
8 of that free-flowing river. This is not an isolated  
9 project. We need to fully assess that risk. We have a  
10 responsibility to evaluate this one project in the context  
11 of the whole system, including the downstream impacts to a  
12 healthy watershed, and the public value of that system.

13 I have one last comment. I know I'm going way  
14 over, sorry, but -- on the other side of the balance sheet  
15 I think that we also have a responsibility to act, really  
16 reflect the value of the dam. And I think it's really to  
17 recognize that this is not the same as it was in the  
18 American Southwest, when there were many communities  
19 desperate for drinking water, desperate for other services  
20 besides power. We do not have those needs here.

21 We are not going to be providing great  
22 recreational value, great drinking water value, and other  
23 services in addition. This is just about the megawatts;  
24 it's just about producing energy. So when we think about  
25 the cost and benefits, we need to keep that in context. I

1 personally believe that the proposed dam does not serve  
2 the best interests of the residents of Alaska, because it  
3 does not optimize the use of a limited and high value  
4 public resource. The costs are excessive. The value that  
5 the Susitna provides as a free-flowing river far outweighs  
6 the benefits of damming it for power. And I hope that  
7 you'll agree with me.

8 MR. TURNER: Mike Wood.

9 MR. WOOD: Okay. I should not have followed my  
10 wife. I got a little different approach. So I look at  
11 this room and I see a monstrous amount of traditional  
12 wisdom here. Which I think Anchorage and Fairbanks, they  
13 might lack a little bit of that concerning this area here.  
14 I look at the people around here, and I've learned a  
15 phenomenal amount in the time that I've lived here.

16 Art Mannix built my house. Art Wettman repaired  
17 my starter. So it runs the gamut in this room. But they  
18 all have a super amount of knowledge, all of which I've  
19 benefited from; because I'm pretty thickheaded. So I can  
20 kind of identify what you guys are going through a little  
21 bit here. I've made a variety of mistakes since we bought  
22 this piece of property, many of which include those logs  
23 Molly talked about, 34-inch butts, you need a lot of those  
24 to build a house, they're far out in the woods, and  
25 they're monsters, because they are fish-fed trees.

1           The fertilized salmon flow into the water and  
2       leave the river -- or into the woods during break-up, and,  
3       holy cow, you can't find these trees anywhere else. They  
4       all lean south too, which makes it tough. That well she's  
5       talking about -- I was advised to dig that in October,  
6       'cause that's the lowest ground water level. Well, my  
7       wife's friends were wrong about that, as I soon found out.  
8       I went 17 feet deep, 5 foot in diameter, dug forever, many  
9       days, hit water, pretty sight, put a culvert in.

10           All of a sudden April rolls around, dry well.  
11       I'm like, "Why is that happening?" And I don't know. So  
12       then a dig I little more, and then November shows up.  
13       And, oh, man, I have no water anymore. And then the river  
14       keeps going down. And every day -- we've looked at this  
15       massive river every day of our lives since we've been  
16       there, which is still is -- just within a life span of a  
17       king salmon; so I'm still learning.

18           At any rate, so we have -- the river freezes up.  
19       And then all of a sudden one day we look out, wall to wall  
20       ice. And I run out to the well and I look in the well,  
21       and, oh, my God, I got 6 feet of water in my well. It's  
22       like dumping a bunch of ice right in a glass. Anyhow, I  
23       traveled 70 miles on this river just today to try to run  
24       away from this and think about what I should say. And at  
25       any rate, you guys -- I still have only lived up there

1 eight years, which is barely the life span of a king.

2 And this integrated licensing process needs time;  
3 lots of time. And I still learn every day, a lot; because  
4 I'm not that bright. So at any rate, as you beat your  
5 heads, we beat our heads, I beat my head; and luckily  
6 there's good people out there giving us a lot of good  
7 information to learn from. At any rate, I guess that's  
8 it.

9 MR. TURNER: Barbara Manninx. Maybe I  
10 mispronounced.

11 MS. MANNINX: Okay. A lot of this is going to be  
12 redundant, but I don't think you guys can hear it too many  
13 times. My name is Barbara Manninx, I'm a long-time  
14 resident of Talkeetna. And I'm extremely concerned about  
15 the proposed Susitna hydro project. And I do not feel  
16 that it is in the best interests of the Alaskan people.  
17 But it's also quite terrifying that AEA is attempting to  
18 fast-track a project of this scale.

19 The Susitna is many things to many people. It  
20 provides a livelihood for many of our local residents; we  
21 use it for transportation, sportsfishing, commercial  
22 fishing, rafting, boating, skiing, snow machining, and dog  
23 mushing. We hold our annual bird counts along its shores.  
24 Its gravel serves as a gathering place for locals and  
25 visitors. And it's a lifeline and the very heartland of

1 Central Alaska. What are my concerns?

2 I'm concerned about shelf ice, caribou, bears,  
3 moose, cottonwood trees, willow. I'm concerned about  
4 sedimentation. The ungodly huge reservoir, the noise  
5 pollution, the habitat loss, the impacts to the Denali  
6 Highway, one of our family's favorite place. I'm  
7 concerned for all the fish; I'm concerned for the bugs  
8 that live in the duff, the fiddlehead ferns, the beavers,  
9 the otters, the waterfowl, salmon, the weasel, the eagles;  
10 the list goes on.

11 I would like to say that studies should be fully  
12 funded with adequate time, years in the case of the  
13 salmon; and with highly qualified staff. But in reality,  
14 even with all best intentions, we human beings with all  
15 our perceived knowledge and gadgets, have yet to fully  
16 grasp the complexities and the interconnectedness of the  
17 natural world. There has never been a dam of this scale  
18 built on a glacially fed river this far north. We can't  
19 know all the answers, and the gamble is too great.

20 The Lower 48 is full of examples of dammed rivers  
21 that turned into tragic mistakes. Destroyed fisheries,  
22 extinct species, invasive species, and devastation to the  
23 land and its life forms. Other states are tearing their  
24 dams down, why in the world are we considering building  
25 one? Alaska needs to broaden its vision and scope and

1 look to other alternatives for sustainable energy and  
2 abandon this catastrophic idea.

3 In closing I say again, that the proposed Susitna  
4 Dam is not in Alaska's best interest. The power generated  
5 in relationship to the cost, wilderness, and wildlife  
6 destruction, the loss of resources, and impacts to users  
7 cannot be justified. There is no price tag on wilderness;  
8 there is no price tag on a free-flowing river. To tell  
9 the people of Alaska that there will be mitigation  
10 measures in place, is a terrible joke.

11 You can not mitigate the destruction of a complex  
12 river ecosystem. And the people in this state do not want  
13 the burden of that cost for a project that makes no sense.  
14 It is my great hope that the legacy that we leave for  
15 future generations of Alaska, will be one valuing the land  
16 and its rivers in ways that transcend the all-mighty  
17 dollar. That politics and greed will not be the shame of  
18 our time as caretakers of this beautiful place we call  
19 homes.

20 It is my great hope that those future generations  
21 will be able to say, "Thank God they didn't build that  
22 thing," rather than, "How could they have done such a  
23 thing, and how do we begin to undo the damage?"

24 MR. TURNER: Thank. Dave Johnston. Dave  
25 Johnston.

1           MR. JOHNSTON: Hi, my name is Dave Johnston. And  
2 this valley has been my home for 41 years. It would seem  
3 so much wiser to be investing 4- or \$5 billion into the  
4 diversity of sources for our electricity, rather than to  
5 be gambling on this one mega project of questionable  
6 integrity. Mega dams are an arcane technology. And to  
7 quote a sage local woman, "Dams aren't cool anymore." The  
8 hasty choice of this dam, as these -- the solution to our  
9 needs, when there are viable alternatives, makes us  
10 question the wisdom of the choice.

11           Is there any chance we could reconsider that  
12 choice? If I were king for a day, I would first mandate  
13 energy efficiency. I would then study thoroughly,  
14 alternatives to the dam, and combinations of alternatives,  
15 tidal, wind, geothermal, solar, smaller hydro, natural  
16 gas. If, and only if, the mega dam is deemed desirable, I  
17 would allow time for thorough studies of all related  
18 resources. I would consider the stand from a paranoid  
19 point of view as well.

20           Wouldn't this dam be a tidy target for future  
21 enemies. They could take out our electrical grid,  
22 railroad, and main highway in one shot. In 1982 I was in  
23 a Talkeetna play, "Not by a Dam Site." The play expressed  
24 our disapproval of Su Hydro. 30 years later, our opinions  
25 haven't changed. We resent that our valley, and we, are

1 treated as sacrificial pawns in this dam game. Thank you.

2 MR. TURNER: Do we have Katie Writer?

3 MS. WRITER: Thank you. Thank you guys for being  
4 here. I know it's been quite a night, you obviously found  
5 out we have a lot of people really passionate about this  
6 area. And I am so damn proud to be in this community.  
7 I've only lived here since 2004, and I am here to speak  
8 for my whole family. And I want to show you why people in  
9 this room are so passionate. You can look at some of  
10 these pages that I've earmarked, and you can see the  
11 river; and you can see the family value that is on this  
12 terrain.

13 I think that it's been -- everybody in this room  
14 has shared so many things, and it makes me so proud to be  
15 part of this. And I am opposed to this dam. And I don't  
16 have anything to say why, because it's already been said.  
17 But I know in my heart that this dam does not belong here.  
18 And I hope you can realize as a family value, as  
19 custodians of this earth, this area is valued so  
20 tremendously, an entire world. We have so many visitors  
21 come here because of the natural value; because of the  
22 beauty; because of the undisturbedness. And this dam  
23 would change that.

24 MR. TURNER: Thank you. I'm going to mess this  
25 up again. Dellarie Henley. Told you I was going to mess

1 it up. I guess they've left. Paul Roderick.

2 MR. RODERICK: Hi, everybody. My name's Paul  
3 Roderick. And I run Talkeetna Air Taxi. And, you know,  
4 we as an organization are opposed to the construction of  
5 the Susitna hydro dam. And here's why: The flights and  
6 tours we operate have everything to do with showing people  
7 from all over the world Alaska's awe-inspiring, expansive  
8 wilderness. And this is what attracts people to Alaska,  
9 and especially Talkeetna.

10 And these tours are one of the main economic  
11 generators of this area. So the destruction of the  
12 wilderness from roads, large gravel extraction pits,  
13 additional power lines, rail lines, and the 700-foot-tall,  
14 half-mile-wide dam itself would detract from the  
15 experience; and in turn, can negatively affect, you know,  
16 the business in this whole community. Untouched wildness  
17 has tremendous economic and social value. And we feel  
18 this is what defines this part of Alaska.

19 And in short, tourists and visitors do not expect  
20 massive development; and are thrilled to see a pristine  
21 place. The salmon will be adversely affected by the dam.  
22 And we feel that no matter what studies are conducted, man  
23 cannot foresee nor emulate through testing what profound  
24 changes will occur. And we cannot expect that a river  
25 that will be artificially manipulated, both in temperature

1 and flow rates, can flourish.

2 FERC, politicians, and corporate entities are  
3 responsible for the demise of salmon runs in many rivers  
4 in America. And this can't go on. A large  
5 natural-flowing river should be considered a national  
6 treasure. And seismic activity in the area of the dam  
7 could potentially cause a catastrophic event, and is not  
8 worth the risk. You know, we've seen area -- large  
9 landslides in the area, especially after the 2002 quake in  
10 the nearby Hayes Range.

11 And the economics of this project -- or the  
12 economics of this project make little sense. There's not  
13 a private company in the world that would take on this  
14 project. And if you just run the numbers and compare the  
15 megawatt production versus construction costs versus  
16 population size, this project seems to be more, you know,  
17 politics than practicality.

18 While flying recently over the Susitna, in the  
19 mid-part of the river, it was apparent, especially this  
20 winter -- 'cause we've had a lot -- you know, a lot of  
21 snow and the moose have kind of had to retreat from, you  
22 know, basically the forest and into the river areas where  
23 the snow is more packed. You can see this is an important  
24 habitat to them. They feed along the rivers since they  
25 can't access it in the summer. And you can see they've

1 really taken refuge and shelter on the river.

2           So the fact that, you know, we're gonna basically  
3 increase the flow rate in the winter, with warmer water,  
4 and also fluctuate due to load following, the effects of  
5 the moose, and -- and the other animals that cross the  
6 rivers in the wintertime could be traumatic. I mean, it  
7 -- and I think it'd be really hard to figure out how one  
8 could just -- how one could even measure, you know, how to  
9 do that. So another point -- last point.

10           Why is AEA in such a rush, and want to push this  
11 project forward? To limit the environmental impact  
12 studies to two years is insensitive to the people in this  
13 area, it should be for most Alaskans. A project of this  
14 magnitude should be carefully vetted with new study and  
15 not rest on outdated data. And the other area that I  
16 haven't heard anybody address is, that fact there -- at  
17 least three Native companies that we -- or Native  
18 corporations that we know of that own land up around the  
19 dam site.

20           And, you know, that hasn't really -- hasn't been  
21 addressed or rectified or has there been any word from the  
22 Native corporations, maybe you know more, Wayne; but we  
23 know up around Fog Lakes is -- you know, that's a -- all  
24 Native land. And I think that's about -- that's about it.  
25 Thanks.

1                   MR. TURNER: We've been at this about three  
2 hours, I'd like to take about a 15-minute break so that  
3 our stenographer can rest her fingers so -- maybe 10 after  
4 9:00 reconvene. Thanks.

5                   (Break.)

6                   MR. TURNER: Next person is Sharon Corsaro.  
7 Sharon, are you out there?

8                   MS. CORSARO: Hi, my name is Sharon Corsaro. I  
9 want to thank the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for  
10 being here. Excuse me, I'm a little nervous. I have many  
11 concerns that have been voiced here already. I'm  
12 concerned for the six species of salmon, the caribou herd  
13 migration, the serious dangers created by changing winter  
14 travel on a frozen body of water that will constantly be  
15 changing. I'm concerned about the glacial silt being  
16 blocked from the salmon, concerns for the operation of the  
17 dam.

18                   And especially, I'm concerned for a very  
19 dangerous earthquake fault line that sits roughly 40 miles  
20 from this dam, from the proposed site for this proposed  
21 dam. For I am hopeful that this Commission will find that  
22 what is proposed is not reasonable, and will deny the  
23 ability of that dam to be built. That fault line produced  
24 a 7.9 earthquake; 7.9, that is enormous. I personally  
25 witnessed the roughly 5-foot change in the road, many,

1 many, miles from where that fault occurred -- where that  
2 earthquake occurred. 5 feet the road changed.

3           What happens to a roughly 800-foot dam, cement  
4 wall -- concrete wall, with an earthquake like that that  
5 cannot be planned for; cannot be anticipated? Could be  
6 like Japan's tsunami. And I will apologize now that I  
7 will go beyond the time limit. How fast would such an  
8 earthquake, and such a dam containing an enormous body of  
9 water, how fast would the registered national historic  
10 place of this community, of Talkeetna, be entirely wiped  
11 out by a dam failure that could come from the earth  
12 moving, because that's what she does?

13           All of these concerns are very real and have been  
14 openly shared here. And I share those concerns, and I'm  
15 not going into all of the details on all of the  
16 environmental issues, which I know you've heard a lot  
17 about. What I have not heard very much, is -- and what I  
18 personally came here to express tonight, is that the State  
19 of Alaska is operating in an environment, a climate unlike  
20 almost any other place in that the State budget has a  
21 surplus of \$14 billion reported in November of 2011. \$14  
22 billion surplus. That's well beyond -- beyond the federal  
23 government as we know.

24           The environment of that kind of money sadly  
25 produces incredibly irresponsible spending. Incredibly

1       wielding of money, because there's so much of it.  
2       Spending that is shooting from the hip; spending that is  
3       -- is not even thought about because it's like pennies.  
4       And very much worse is spending that is influenced by  
5       parties who stand to make billions of dollars off this  
6       State's budget; off this State's payday of money.

7               My very real concern is that this State does not  
8       know how to act responsibly with all of that money. And  
9       my hope and prayer is that this Commission is the only  
10      hope that we have of somebody looking at the facts,  
11      recognizing that we've got enormous environmental cost, an  
12      enormous financial cost, enormous impact, for very little  
13      gain. There are factors they are not being talked about  
14      as to why this State government is -- is wanting to do  
15      this project.

16             And I am here to ask you, I am calling upon this  
17      Federal Commission to do what you are charged with doing  
18      across this nation; and that is, to regulate energy  
19      projects with prudent and responsible actions. Unlike  
20      most places, I can only imagine, and I do not say -- I do  
21      not pretend to be an expert, but I can only imagine that  
22      money plays such a huge factor. When there is a limit of  
23      resources, everyone is concerned about what is going to be  
24      done because it's costing precious money. The difference  
25      here is that there is so much of that money that people

1 don't pay attention.

2 That the State government is ready to throw money  
3 at anything to get what looks like on paper something.  
4 There is a mandate that there be renewable energy. The  
5 Governor sadly, and the Legislature sadly, believe that  
6 this is going to provide -- this is going to be -- this is  
7 their -- this is their answer to solving that renewable  
8 energy problem. 300 -- roughly 300 megawatts of power for  
9 a cost of something like \$8 billion, and irrevocable  
10 damage and changes to a natural environment that is  
11 irreplaceable.

12 I am begging this Commission, and I -- honestly I  
13 hold enormous hope that this Commission has the sense --  
14 the common sense, is the adult in the room, that will say  
15 to the elected officials in Alaska, you all need a  
16 strategic energy plan with these enormous resources you  
17 have. You can buy the world's greatest consultants to  
18 give you grounded, solid, real answers for how to plan for  
19 your energy future well into the future. That's what  
20 needs to happen here.

21 Where is there a plan? Instead it's all  
22 influenced. It's all influenced by mega corporations who  
23 have mega dollars to make off of this state. This state  
24 needs FERC to say no to this project, and to demand that  
25 the State of Alaska get responsible with how it is

1 planning its energy future. Because the cost of energy  
2 down the road is -- already it's enough to bankrupt -- the  
3 heating costs in this state, which this dam serves to do  
4 nothing about, the heating costs are enough to bankrupt  
5 healthy families.

6 The State of Alaska needs real answers,  
7 exhaustive research, exhaustive strategic planning for  
8 what to do, how to utilize all of that budget surplus.  
9 How to utilize all of this money to plan a real energy  
10 future that can drastically help the State of Alaska, and  
11 further drastically help the United States, the whole  
12 nation. I have pages which I'm not going to look at  
13 because I think I've said enough.

14 MR. TURNER: Just a couple more and then we'll  
15 let you come back.

16 MS. CORSARO: I want to thank you again, and I  
17 will reiterate that I believe you all are the adult in the  
18 room; that you all have the ability to say no; and you  
19 have the ability also to empower Alaska to do right for  
20 its people; and most especially, be responsible stewards  
21 for its land. Thank you.

22 MR. TURNER: William Barsky. B-a-s-k-y.

23 MR. BARSKY: Hi, I'm Morgan Barsky. And I just  
24 want to make a quick comment here. Thank you for coming.  
25 This must be a tough job. And -- well, I have a lot of

1 things to say; but also I can't remember any of them. I  
2 am opposed to this dam project. I think it reeks of  
3 nepotism; and I really agree with the last speaker and  
4 say, "Thank you for being the adult in the room." And  
5 hopefully that you can -- yeah, do what the federal  
6 government is really supposed to do, and be a, you know,  
7 oversight. And keep the kids in line.

8 I really feel like this dam would impact the  
9 aesthetics, the cultural resources, the socioeconomic  
10 resources, and the developmental resources of our state.  
11 It would transplant the opportunity to develop a more  
12 unique and creative energy solutions, which could be of  
13 great value to the state's economy, instead of falling  
14 back on what is ancient technology essentially.

15 Everything else has been said, and I think also  
16 that the two-year study plan is just ludicrous; and seven  
17 years seems reasonable. Thank you.

18 MR. TURNER: And I think this is Gerald Sousa.  
19 Thank you.

20 MR. SOUSA: Hi, thank you. My name is Gerald  
21 Sousa; I go by Jerry. First of all, I feel like a  
22 threatened and endangered species. I oppose the dam. We  
23 have a -- Talkeetna Adventure Company, so we operate three  
24 businesses, employ about five people seasonally in the  
25 summer. All of that if this dam goes through will most

1 likely go away. We will probably become bankrupt, go out  
2 of business, and have to relocate.

3 First of all, there are mushers. I'm an Iditarod  
4 musher. I've mushed the Iditarod 11 years, 12 years now.  
5 I use the Susitna River drainage, the Susitna specific to  
6 train on. With open water year-around, going up though  
7 the across -- or across the river. So my mushing -- as a  
8 long-distance musher we need to travel long distances to  
9 train. That's going to be gone for as long as the dam is  
10 in place.

11 So we could probably relocate up to the Cantwell  
12 area, which is another popular mushing area; however, with  
13 the 8,000-foot runway and 2,000 people living up in that  
14 area, and the road becoming plowed, that will not be an  
15 option either. So our mushing career will probably be cut  
16 short, and we will no longer be able to have that cultural  
17 resource. Secondly, we're sportfishing operators.

18 I've fished the Talkeetna-Susitna drainage for  
19 over 20 years. And I'm sure there's some biological  
20 studies out there talk about the decline of the salmon.  
21 The Talkeetna drainage and specific is host to thousands,  
22 millions of salmon fry. First and foremost, I think that  
23 mostly likely the biologists haven't thought of this yet,  
24 is that in the springtime the rivers start to silt up,  
25 called turbidite.

1           So it's first the Chulitna; then the Susitna;  
2           then the Talkeetna. The Talkeetna fry are being basically  
3           flushed down the river towards the Susitna. With now this  
4           new proposed dam, the Susitna will become clear water,  
5           which means the predation of those fry will extend the  
6           predators' chance to feed on those salmon fry, which will  
7           decline the populations. We also have another clear and  
8           present danger in the Lower Susitna Valley, and that is of  
9           the pike.

10           So with the warmer waters, slower flow rates, the  
11           pike will most likely be able to migrate up into the  
12           Susitna -- Upper Susitna drainage to Talkeetna specific.  
13           A line for opening feeding ground for all those species of  
14           salmon, that will be gobbled up; and of course, with that  
15           happening, there'll be fewer returning salmon;  
16           sportfishing closures will ensue; we'll again be out of  
17           business.

18           So I would hope that this Commission can see  
19           that, while making lots of job elsewhere, it will  
20           certainly take jobs away from us. Thank you.

21           MR. TURNER: Kathleen Holden.

22           MS. HOLDEN: Good evening, everybody. My name's  
23           Kathleen Holden. Jerry here has a prop for me. I'm here  
24           on behalf of queen salmon. Queen salmon will no longer  
25           exist on the upper Susitna River. Just as Jerry stated,

1 she will be preyed upon because the river will be clear,  
2 and her fry will no longer reach the ocean. I was born  
3 and raised in New Zealand, came to Alaska many years ago  
4 when I was young and foolish; now, I'm old and foolish.

5 I could have lived anywhere in the world. I was  
6 traveling around the world, and I chose the Susitna River  
7 Valley. I've been here for 32 years; that was in 1980. I  
8 could have, if I had wanted to live in a dammed river  
9 valley, I would have moved to California or to Colorado,  
10 or I could have stayed in New Zealand; one of the most  
11 beautiful, pristine countries in the world. But I've  
12 chosen this valley to live, and I want it to remain as it  
13 is. Thank you very much.

14 MR. TURNER: That was the last person that  
15 indicated they wanted to speak. And it's 9:30 and the  
16 people are beginning to dwindle. Wanye has asked to have  
17 a few minutes to address some of your comments before  
18 anybody else leaves. So I'm gonna turn it over to him for  
19 a few minutes; and then go back to you as I promised,  
20 we'll stay here until we hear everybody's concerns.

21 MR. DYOK: I'll keep this brief. I really  
22 appreciate everybody's comments here tonight. I've  
23 learned a lot. I really have. I worked on this river in  
24 the '80s. And there's been a tremendous increase in  
25 tourism; I understand that. Lots of other things; and I

1 appreciate the passion, the love that you have for this  
2 area. Robert, you said that I spoke of this as a done  
3 deal. Let me assure you, that I do not want to give that  
4 impression. This is by no means a done deal, okay.

5 First and foremost, the Federal Energy Regulatory  
6 Commission needs to make their decision, number one;  
7 number two, the Governor's office needs to make a  
8 decision; number three, my board needs to make a decision;  
9 number four, the Legislature needs to make a decision; and  
10 number five, as we do the studies, if there's any  
11 insurmountable problems that we can't overcome, I promise  
12 you, I'll be the first one to say that we can't overcome  
13 it.

14 And I know it's going to take a lot to earn your  
15 trust; I'm trying to do objective studies here. I have  
16 directed my staff to make sure that things that we do are  
17 objective, as we go forward. And I invite you to work  
18 with me. And Mary, you said, we had to produce the  
19 information about the costs and we hadn't put that on our  
20 Web site, that's correct. And I'll just -- this is the  
21 only thing I'll mention.

22 The reason for that is we wanted to do an  
23 independent cost estimate, and I didn't want to give the  
24 information to the folks that would be doing that  
25 independent cost estimate. I want that to be truly an

1 independent cost estimate. They'll get the quantities,  
2 but not the prices for each of the quantities. And we  
3 want to be able to compare those two to make sure that  
4 we're getting realistic costs.

5           Anyway, that's all I want to say. And I really  
6 do appreciate the comments from the approximately 40  
7 speakers that have eloquently spoken here this evening.  
8 And I appreciate the effort that you've all put forward,  
9 and I see your passion. Thank you.

10           MR. TURNER: As I promised, is there anybody else  
11 out there that hasn't had an opportunity to say something  
12 that would like to?

13           MR. MCCAIN: I thought I was on the list.

14           MR. TURNER: I may have missed it but --

15           MR. MCCAIN: Ed McCain. I've lived in Alaska  
16 since the -- before it was a state, and I've seen a lot of  
17 changes. And I'm for this project because we need to do  
18 something for our kids and grandkids, a lasting legacy. I  
19 have a daughter that was living in Yakima Valley, and she  
20 was heating her home with electricity on dam projects that  
21 were built 70 and 80 years ago.

22           To me, hydro is the only proven source of  
23 electricity. And I think we need to open up some more  
24 land with these roads and stuff going to this project so  
25 that my kids and grandkids can enjoy the same thing that

1 I've enjoyed in this state for over 50 years. Thank you.

2 MR. TURNER: Sorry, if I missed you. Anybody  
3 else that would like to add anything?

4 MR. LUTTRELL: My name is Max Luttrell. Got here  
5 about eight months ago. I'll give you a little -- I was  
6 stationed in Washington State for like seven years, I was  
7 an avid fisherman, hunter. You want to look something up  
8 on a computer, look up the Emerald River in Washington  
9 State. They did legislation, I think last year, to  
10 finally do away with the Emerald Dam they have. And it's  
11 supposed to be abolished by 2013, 'cause the salmon runs  
12 went down to nothing, steelhead runs were down to nothing;  
13 there's a Native area, they couldn't live on it.

14 Salmon will be affected. But you as a group have  
15 to come -- get together and go after the legislators of  
16 Alaska. If you don't, they may jam it down your throat.  
17 I know Mr. Steadman's on the fire -- committee, he's  
18 watching TV, I have nothing to do basically; I'm watching  
19 TV a lot, and he said, \$4 billion, and -- year number.  
20 And he said, "Well, a couple years ago." A lady awhile  
21 go, in the back she said we had a \$14 billion surplus.

22 Well, hate to say this, but -- there's a PERS and  
23 TERS deduction that they haven't been really promoting of  
24 9 billion. So you only got about 4 billion of actual  
25 pocket money, and this money will take it all. And plus

1       overruns, so you're gonna go into debt. I came from the  
2       Lower 48 in August; they're broke. Towns have rolled up  
3       the streets and gone home. Obama doesn't have no money to  
4       give you.

5                So you're going to pay for it if this thing goes  
6       through. If you don't fuck your legislators and tell them  
7       where you stand, Fairbanks and Anchorage, Juneau, they're  
8       a lot bigger than Talkeetna, and you're the ones  
9       downstream from it. And that's all I have to say.

10               MR. GUALTIRI: I was on the list too, but -- must  
11       have missed my name. Hi, my name's Doug Gualticri. And  
12       thank you for coming up here and hearing us out. You can  
13       tell there's a lot of passion, mostly against this  
14       project. A few folks spoke in favor of it. I just looked  
15       through your brochure here, and I just saw an alarming  
16       flow chart that ends in, "FERC issues license order." Is  
17       that really the way it goes?

18               MR. TURNER: A license order doesn't mean that's  
19       a license, it could be --

20               MR. GUALTIRI: Okay, okay. Well, that's one  
21       thing. And obviously with -- with all this passion you've  
22       heard from our community here, a small community, a  
23       thousand people who live in this area roughly. You guys  
24       were in Anchorage, what, yesterday or a couple day ago; or  
25       one of your groups, and you might have heard people in

1 favor of the project down there. That's our population  
2 base, that's where this energy's gonna go. It's really  
3 not going to get used here. We're not that spike to 800  
4 megawatts at 8:00 o'clock at night. That's Anchorage and  
5 Wasilla, and Palmer, where the population is. But they  
6 don't live on this river.

7 And most of those people that might have attended  
8 that meeting probably never even seen it. Or been north  
9 of Eagle River for that matter. Put the dam in Eagle  
10 River, and let them deal with it. Let their recreational  
11 playground get destroyed; let their scenery get destroyed;  
12 let an entire complex ecosystem get demolished for a  
13 30-year gain of energy, maybe. That's not gonna -- 5  
14 billion or more dollars, that's not gonna do it.

15 Use that money more wisely somewhere else.  
16 Geothermal, hydro -- or tidal. We have -- we could  
17 provide more tidal to run most of the country in Alaska  
18 alone. So -- and I think with the -- maybe a billion or  
19 2, you might be able to figure that out. And then lastly,  
20 you're a fisheries biologist; right?

21 People have mentioned here briefly -- it's not  
22 just those 50 king salmon that need to get through Devil's  
23 Canyon, okay. It's the whole frickin' river, from where  
24 it starts to where it ends at the mouth of Cook Inlet.  
25 Those salmon know -- they don't go to Cooper River,

1       because that's not their home, they go to the Susitna  
2       River. And you're gonna change the entire chemistry of  
3       that -- I'm a biologist; I know a little bit about this  
4       stuff.

5               That whole river's going to be changed. Some of  
6       the salmon might not even return to the streams  
7       downstream, because when they nose into this mouth of  
8       Susitna River, this isn't the Susitna River; this wasn't  
9       the river I was raised in; I don't belong here; and they  
10      might not ever come back to spawn. And that's been proven  
11      in the 80 years of experimental salmon destruction in  
12      Pacific Northwest.

13              There's no need for your very short, lame, and  
14      inappropriate two-year study period. We have 80 years of  
15      that data already; it doesn't work. Salmon get wiped out;  
16      our livelihoods; people's area to recreate, whatever; it  
17      just gets destroyed, so -- but I hope this does mean  
18      something. It feels awfully predetermined, but I hope  
19      that you guys really do listen to what folks have said  
20      here and take that into account, and the written comments  
21      too; so I appreciate it. Thanks.

22              MR. TURNER: Thank you.

23              MS. SAYRE: My name's Cari Sayre. And I just  
24      have been sitting, thinking, and writing notes all  
25      evening; so let me just give my two cents' worth. People

1 have spoken of the impacts to the river and the valley and  
2 the ecosystems and the downstream communities. I want you  
3 to also understand the tremendous impacts to the area  
4 between the Parks Highway, the Denali Highway, and the  
5 Susitna River.

6 Building roads into the pristine -- into this  
7 pristine wilderness area, is like cutting a gash into a  
8 baby's pristine body. Untold previously unknown organisms  
9 have an opening into the ecosystem, or the organism,  
10 tipping the balance towards unhealthy. Think about that.  
11 This person who wanted to save that area -- to allow their  
12 kids and grandkids access to that area, that area will not  
13 be the same as it is now, as it was hundreds of year ago.  
14 We need to preserve that.

15 This is the other part of it. When I go shopping  
16 for goods or services, I like to check out all my options.  
17 Both in terms of variety of goods and services and in  
18 terms of cost. If I want more information, often a  
19 salesperson will provide me with alternatives and a cost  
20 and analysis. I wish the tables were turned in this  
21 process, we're doing this all backwards. We need the  
22 consumers of energy in the Railbelt area -- we consumers  
23 need to go shopping.

24 The -- AEA, the authoritative voice of energy in  
25 Alaska should be listening to the public as to our energy

1 needs, and then educating the public as to all the options  
2 for meeting those needs. This is not the best option;  
3 it's not the only option; and we need to look into other  
4 options. And FERC needs to look beyond this proposal and  
5 see the big picture, and the tremendous impacts to the  
6 ecosystem to our little community that we love.

7 And I've been here 33 years, and we love it  
8 dearly. And absolutely deny this license, again, again, a  
9 second time. We know that the damming was a bad idea in  
10 1982; we fought it then. The Susitna, it's an equally bad  
11 idea to dam the Susitna 30 years later in 2012. Thank you  
12 for your time.

13 MR. GRAUPMANN: My name, Jim Graupmann. I'd like  
14 to say, first of all, thank you all for coming, appreciate  
15 your time. I would like to say I'm opposed to the dam. I  
16 don't know anything about engineering a dam; I do know a  
17 little bit about airplanes. One of the things I heard  
18 tonight is a chance of a catastrophic failure of the dam,  
19 through the earthquakes. And the way I understand it, if  
20 I understand it correctly, they're going to engineer the  
21 dam to the maximum expected earthquake in the area.

22 Well, I want to ask the people sitting at the  
23 tables here, if you only engineered an airliner to handle  
24 the maximum expected turbulence, would you feel good about  
25 getting on it? We engineer the airplanes well beyond what

1       you think you're ever got to experience in turbulence or  
2       any catastrophic failure like that. So to say we're going  
3       to engineer it to what we can expect, doesn't really seem  
4       prudent to me.

5                I think we should engineer it -- if it is going  
6       to be built, at least one-and-a-half, two times what we  
7       could ever expect, not just to what we can expect. So  
8       thank you for your time.

9                MR. MANNIX: Thank you. My name is Arthur  
10       Mannix. 35-year resident of the Upper Susitna Valley. I  
11       was a -- an official intervenor in the Susitna proceedings  
12       in the early '80s. At that time it was before computers,  
13       before the digital age. And so they sent us all the  
14       information for all the studies in hard copy. And by the  
15       time all is said and done, the amount of information I had  
16       -- they'd send it to me in a -- cardboard boxes that were  
17       -- probably weighed -- oh, they're about a cubic foot,  
18       probably right about 50 pounds apiece.

19               By the time all was said and done, I had a wood  
20       shed half filled with cardboard boxes of studies from the  
21       last proceedings. Our river system here is wonderfully  
22       complex, and I have a degree in biology, and I used it for  
23       -- make a living or anything like that; but I just use it  
24       for trying to be informed at a minuscule level as to how  
25       wonderfully diverse this area is. And after a -- you

1 know, I'm a -- I skimmed mountains, and, you know, half a  
2 woodshed filled with documentation on some amazing  
3 information for this valley.

4 And I really think that at this point in time,  
5 the issues are even more complex; and granted, our energy  
6 needs are greater, but so is -- our society has a great  
7 deal need for these types of -- of very unique situations  
8 that we have here. So I think if anything comes out of  
9 this meeting that you have to take home with you, that two  
10 years is much too short a time frame. In a way, this  
11 meeting started off in August to the process, you know,  
12 you wanted us to hurry up through -- you know, everybody  
13 speak for three minutes. And this is just a little  
14 microcosm of the much bigger process.

15 You know, give us more than three minutes of  
16 study. You know, for this -- for this extended to at  
17 least, you know, a -- two years it's ridiculous. You know  
18 -- you know, the more you probe into something the more  
19 actually -- the more questions arise, you know. So if you  
20 only do it for two years, you realize you have to do it  
21 for six years, you know. Really. So if you study it for  
22 six years, you probably realize, jeez, we really should  
23 for studying this for 12 years. So it needs more study.  
24 Thanks a lot.

25 MR. WOOD: Sorry. I got flustered before so I

1 forgot one major thing I wanted to mention. Mike Wood;  
2 still opposed to the dam. Sometime in the early -- or  
3 mid-80s through the '90s I spent a lot of time on the  
4 glaciers in the Eastern Alaska Range, because that's where  
5 they made me go work. And I'd spend 30 days out there  
6 traveling from the Black Rapids up and over and down onto  
7 the Susitna Glacier, down -- up to Black Rapids again, and  
8 then down on the McLaren. I've walked out of both of  
9 those, and in the Black Rapids many times.

10 And what I noticed over the years was how much  
11 those glaciers were changing. That were really dropping  
12 fast. In fact, one year I went back there -- well, Paula  
13 as we rationed she had a real hard time one year, flying  
14 out of there looked pretty scary. Went back the following  
15 year, and we couldn't even walk across that glacier; it  
16 had dropped like 300 feet from its bergschrunds. And we  
17 were camping on that glacier the year before.

18 In years since then I've continued to go back and  
19 pay attention; and the glaciers, which provide the water  
20 for the Susitna River, which carries the silt, are  
21 reducing at an astronomical rate. And I don't know who --  
22 I just needed to mention that. If -- with their studies  
23 being done looking at the glaciers would probably be a  
24 cool one to look at. So that's it.

25 The whole side of Mount McGinnis during that

1 earthquake washed across the Black Rapids Glacier and up  
2 the other side. So now there's a mountain of debris which  
3 -- I mean, you couldn't even imagine; it's more -- it's  
4 bigger than this school, washed across the glacier. And  
5 it was -- that mountain is bigger than the dam, I think,  
6 so -- and up the other side of the mountain.

7 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Just to expound upon what Arthur  
8 Mannix -- I'm also still from my previous -- still against  
9 the dam. From -- just to expound upon what Mike was  
10 saying, the fern line on the glaciers back in the late  
11 '70s, I used to guide on Mount McKinley. The fern line  
12 was well down towards the -- turns at like the -- glacier.  
13 The fern line, which is the -- where the fernulates  
14 accumulates -- now -- is dozens of miles up the glacier  
15 now.

16 Back in the late '70s and early '80s, typical  
17 summer flows on the rivers were substantially higher for  
18 longer periods of time. And in hindsight -- I've gone  
19 down a number of the rivers with a number of hydrologists  
20 and biologists, and in discussing it, what we had here 25  
21 years ago on the glaciers, with the fern line being so  
22 much lower on the glaciers, was enormous amounts of snow.  
23 Well, that snow has melted in the past 25 years. Snow  
24 melts quicker than ice.

25 So the records -- a lot of the records that they

1 had on the -- from all the early '80 studies, were from  
2 rivers that were flowing with -- because the -- so much  
3 snow was melting. Now, the summertime flows on the rivers  
4 are not as substantial as they were in the late '70s,  
5 early '80s. So -- and also, everybody seen the  
6 photograph, 40 mile -- the big earthquake, the 7.,  
7 whatever earthquake it was, Black Rapids Glacier, just off  
8 of one mountainside, 40 miles from the dam site, there was  
9 a -- a pile of debris that was 250 feet high, half a mile  
10 wide by three miles long.

11 Easily dozens of times the cubic mass -- the  
12 cubic volume of any dam that you could build. So that was  
13 from one event, 40 miles from the dam site, that produced  
14 a debris pile that was dozens and dozens and dozens of  
15 times the size of your proposed project.

16 MR. MENARD: Yeah, my name is George Menard. And  
17 I've lived in this area for 43 areas. And I just have a  
18 little food for thought, some things that haven't been  
19 touched on. I'm an electronic vendor, as some of you  
20 might know. And for the last week and a half, I know of  
21 dozens of people out there that live off grid, that  
22 haven't had to run their generators whatsoever; they're  
23 getting trillions of frontons from the sun that are being  
24 converted into conventional 120-volt AC household power,  
25 and it's routine.

1           The technology is right there on the shelf for  
2 anybody to take advantage of. But just a -- for a little  
3 perspective, what they're proposing to spend on this dam  
4 project, just at the current spending level of  
5 \$4-and-a-half billion -- so at any rate, they're -- what  
6 they're proposing is spending \$7-and-a-half per installed  
7 watt for the dam. And this is based at the 600 megawatt  
8 production level, which I think they considered peak.

9           In the Lower 48 right now, utilities' solar  
10 electric projects are coming in at about one third of  
11 that. So we're talking about spending three times as much  
12 for the same amount of energy production that's  
13 off-the-shelf technology right now. And it could be  
14 distributed. It doesn't have to be all plopped down in  
15 one potentially catastrophic event that could happen any  
16 time in the future.

17           The other thing that hasn't been addressed, is  
18 what is this -- the carbon input or imprint -- footprint,  
19 yeah, that's what I'm looking for. What's the carbon  
20 footprint of the construction of this project? Not just  
21 the -- all the diesel that's going to be burned up for  
22 road construction, moving material, building up the dam  
23 itself; but the concrete that's going to go into it that  
24 is horrendously -- it produces a lot of carbon dioxide in  
25 the process.

1           So I'd like to see an analysis done -- a study  
2 done of what's the -- what's going to be the impact of the  
3 carbon -- footprint that will be generated. And what is  
4 the sunk -- the sunk investment in carbon is going to be  
5 out there in the atmosphere as a result; and how many  
6 years will the dam have to operate to offset that carbon  
7 footprint?

8           And just lastly, looking at this economic thing  
9 from a different standpoint. If you consider that every  
10 household in Alaska could have a pretty nice portable tank  
11 power system for the cost that is gonna be sunk into this  
12 dam. Every household in Alaska, whether it's here in the  
13 Railbelt or out in the village, and I'm not claiming that  
14 this is the ultimate answer; it's not; but it could be  
15 part of the answer. Thank you.

16           MR. TURNER: Anyone else want to make a  
17 statement?

18           MS. WOLF: I just wanted to ask --

19           MR. TURNER: Sure. Come on up.

20           MS. WOLF: It's just a follow-through. Just I  
21 wanted to ask a question. If this -- does FERC usually  
22 post meetings in the newspapers? But I already brought  
23 the question up earlier, but -- Ellen Wolf. And I just  
24 was wondering, is it required for FERC to -- FERC to post  
25 meetings in newspapers and other places?

1           MR. TURNER: We do post our scheduled meetings.  
2 We did it in the Anchorage paper and one in Fairbanks.  
3 And I think one out of Wasilla, but I don't know the dates  
4 that it actually showed up.

5           MS. WOLFF: Can I add one more thing? My name's  
6 Whitney Wolff. I just had a couple more things I wanted  
7 to add. I wanted them -- in light of the fish biologist.  
8 I just -- I know that fish passage and the conditioning  
9 for that is -- is only covered at the dam site. And I'm  
10 hoping there's some way we can get on the record that it  
11 would be good to see -- in our case we hear a number of  
12 people have quoted AEA saying that a small handful of the  
13 kings that make it past Devil's Canyon are the only issue  
14 that we'll be dealing with for anadromous fish barriers.

15           And I would like it to on the record that as  
16 those flow rates drop, the potential for the access to be  
17 lost to the side slews for spawning, I think should also  
18 be considered a barrier. And I just wanted to get that on  
19 the record. And one other thing for the recreational  
20 scoping; and I know that those agencies are going to be  
21 listening to this, so I just wanted to get it on the  
22 record also.

23           Is that the project's going to compromise one of  
24 the world's classic whitewater runs up there at the  
25 Devil's Canyon. And I just wanted to quote author Andy

1 Embick in his book "Fast and Cold," described the Devil's  
2 Canyon run as the Mount Everest of kayaking. It notes  
3 that it's the biggest whitewater on this continent, and  
4 one of the biggest whitewater runs in the world. He noted  
5 that it traveled upstream -- that the boaters are traveled  
6 upstream with the second biggest anadromous fish migration  
7 of any river in the world. Hosting all the species of  
8 salmon with its vast length and value. And that these  
9 wild river elements added to the wilderness value of that  
10 river experience.

11 So that should be included also in some of the  
12 gaps in the recreational data, as well as the trip that  
13 Tom was so beautifully walking us through with his ashes  
14 there at the Watana Creek. That trip will be completely  
15 eliminated with the reservoir, so that should also go on  
16 record. And the last thing, and maybe later after the  
17 meeting you could clarify it for me, is these 2012  
18 studies; I know that you guys have embarked on those, and  
19 they're not part of the FERC process.

20 But when I looked back through the notes in the  
21 PAD, I noticed that -- David, that you had been in a  
22 conversation with AEA, and that was suggesting that would  
23 be a good way to, you know, work around this two-year  
24 period. So I think it would be nice if there was some  
25 transparency with the 2012 studies, since they're not part

1 of the FERC process, that the public could be somehow more  
2 involved in how those studies are gonna be handled; and  
3 that's it. Thank you.

4 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: My name is Maureen McLaughlin.  
5 And I am unequivocally opposed to this dam project. And I  
6 had a number of things I was going to say, but I want to  
7 mostly focus on your timing of the program. I work for a  
8 federal agency as well, National Park Service. And I have  
9 watched in the last number of years, many public processes  
10 go through. Where time has been spent listening to people  
11 in the room and where our original plans have changed and  
12 altered and have responded to the people in question. And  
13 I beg you to do the same.

14 And on the timing front, I was just thinking, we  
15 have been considering putting four parking places on land  
16 that we own right in downtown Talkeetna, and we've been  
17 studying it for more than two years. And I beg that you  
18 put a lot more thought and a lot or study into the stand  
19 and what it could do to our ecosystem, and what it could  
20 do to our economy. Please. Thank you for coming, and  
21 thank you for listening to us.

22 MS. HENKE: I'm Ellie Henke, and I had one other  
23 thought that occurred to me. Talking about the huge scope  
24 of this project, and another question that comes up is:  
25 The impact that this will have to traffic and physical

1 impact to the Parks Highway. All of this stuff has to  
2 come from somewhere, as do all the workers, et cetera, et  
3 cetera; should be something else to look into.

4 MR. BIRDSALL: Cary Birdsall. I had a question  
5 for Wayne. You look like a good guy; and, you know,  
6 you've given some words of assurance that if this dam  
7 project turns out to look bad, that you'll be the first to  
8 say so. And I was surprised, because I thought that the  
9 way things worked was, that the AEA had been commissioned  
10 by the Legislature to make this happen. So I really  
11 appreciate you clearing that up, because, I mean, it's  
12 okay; but I'm confused now.

13 MR. DYOK: My responsibility as charged by AEA is  
14 to study the project, understand the impacts, and make  
15 sure that we've addressed the impacts, and mitigated them.  
16 And when I say, you know, all the impacts, we have to look  
17 at each impact. And let's take salmon, because salmon's a  
18 really important one. We have to understand the dynamics  
19 of the salmon. And let's say that project -- let me back  
20 up. Let's say tourism, I think Israel talked about the  
21 flow that he needs to get into Devil's Canyon, okay. It  
22 was a hundred thousand -- 120,000 people that look at  
23 that.

24 We did the calculation of the socioeconomic  
25 impact, we lay everything out, if it doesn't pencil out; I

1 -- I don't believe that I can get the flows that he would  
2 probably need to -- 23,000 CFS during the summertime; if  
3 that's the case, then I go and tell, you know, my board,  
4 this can't work under these conditions. They then will  
5 make the determination if they go forward and recommend to  
6 the Legislature and the Governor that this project goes  
7 forward.

8 Same thing with salmon. If -- if we go through  
9 our studies, we find that we just haven't -- there's just  
10 no way to mitigate the impacts -- and I think somebody's  
11 going to have to make that value judgment; what's  
12 acceptable and what's not acceptable. That's part of  
13 their responsibility. But we as Alaskans, that's part of  
14 our responsibility as well. And that's where you come in.  
15 And I will -- I want to give the ultimate decision-makers  
16 the information on -- on whether or not this project has  
17 adverse impacts that cannot be mitigated.

18 It's not going to be my decision, but I want to  
19 make sure that they know what can be mitigated and what  
20 can't be mitigated. And then ultimately decision-makers  
21 above me. Every energy project results in choices. There  
22 isn't a single energy project that doesn't have, you know,  
23 impacts in some way, shape, or form. And I think the --  
24 the, you know, the comments about the pristine -- I don't  
25 know how to value that quite frankly.

1           I think that's something that -- you've done a  
2           very good job of communicating to us; and there's just no  
3           way I could mitigate that -- that's a decision that's  
4           somebody else will have to -- have to deal with. My job  
5           is to look at all of the resources issues here, along with  
6           the staff that we have, in an objective -- and I always  
7           say, open, honest, and transparent process. And please --  
8           came to my office on the basis of that open, honest, and  
9           transparent to sit down and spend a few hours with me to  
10          go through some of his thoughts. I think we had a pretty  
11          good, you know, dialogue.

12           I have tremendous respect for -- for Jan. And I  
13          would offer that same opportunity to anybody to go  
14          through. It's ultimately not going to be my decision, but  
15          if there was something -- related to the salmon or winter  
16          flows that -- one of the things that we do have to spend  
17          more time, that we didn't really do as good a job as we  
18          should have in the 1980s, was in the winter over --  
19          rearing of the juvenile fish, both the residents and  
20          anadromous. We got to understand that.

21           And if the -- if the flow in the wintertime --  
22          say averages around 8,000-cubic feet per second, if that's  
23          going to wipe them out, that's a problem. Okay. Now, do  
24          I believe that? At this point -- you know, I've worked on  
25          a lot of different, you know, river systems; and I've

1 always been able to pass the folks who are the experts,  
2 not to make it worse but to make it better; does this  
3 work? And I think we've got the right, you know, group to  
4 do that.

5 But ultimately, I want to have the information  
6 for you to be able to see, yes, this is an impact; no,  
7 this is not an impact. Work that through. And then  
8 somebody will have to make that decision. And I'll be the  
9 first to say, "This is a huge impact; I can't mitigate it;  
10 if I can't mitigate it, or if my team can't mitigate it."  
11 Did I confuse you here? I think I've kind of spoken --

12 MR. BIRDSALL: No. I guess so you're an adviser  
13 to AEA? But AEA has been commissioned --

14 MR. DYOK: No. AEA has been commissioned to  
15 study and submit a license and get the license -- Senate  
16 Bill 42 says -- authorizes the Alaska Energy Authority to  
17 construct a project on the Susitna -- or hydro project on  
18 the Susitna River. I think that's -- that's pretty clear.  
19 But we need to make sure that as we go forward, we lay out  
20 all the facts for the decision-makers. And I think the  
21 Governor wants to develop the -- you know, the resource.  
22 But I also think the Governor -- from the discussions that  
23 I've had with his office, is a reasonable person.

24 And if there are mitigation impacts that we just  
25 can't tolerate, I think he would mostly -- likely -- I

1 can't speak for him, but I would think that that would be  
2 the kind of thing that would be important for him to -- to  
3 weigh. Nobody wants to hurt the resources in this state,  
4 okay. But as I said, there's -- the impacts associated  
5 with everything that we, you know, that we do, we have to  
6 make -- you know, we have to make choices.

7 And I really heard today how you value the, you  
8 know, the pristine. It's not -- that particular decision  
9 wouldn't be mine. But the decisions on what we could have  
10 to do for the salmon to mitigate those impacts, to make  
11 sure that we don't -- I mean, nobody wants to wipe out any  
12 salmon. And I think the -- we talked about the kings up  
13 in the Devil Canyon. But I'm just as concerned about all  
14 salmon species all the way down to Cook Inlet.

15 And I'm concerned about the beluga whales down  
16 there too, because they feed on the salmon. And we have  
17 to understand the effects on that. And what I'm saying  
18 is, we put all that together, and -- and then look at all  
19 the things -- and then you make your decision, and you get  
20 to go to the Legislature, the same as the people in  
21 Wasilla or -- Fairbanks, who have other needs.

22 And ultimately somebody's who gonna have to make  
23 decisions on which is the best way to go. But we at least  
24 do it on the basis of facts. And as I said, if there's  
25 something that can't be mitigated, I will recommend that

1 this cannot be mitigated.

2 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Is there anything in the  
3 pipeline for an overall energy plan?

4 MR. TURNER: The Power Authority put together in  
5 a Railbelt integrated resources plan, that should be on  
6 the AEA Web site. It is on the AEA Web site.

7 PUBLIC SPEAKER: It is.

8 MR. TURNER: I think that's -- really the plan  
9 that we're working within right now.

10 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Wayne -- excuse me. I have a  
11 question for you.

12 MR. TURNER: Can you guys do this on the record  
13 as opposed to -- we can close the meeting --

14 PUBLIC SPEAKER: I think it's good to be on the  
15 record.

16 PUBLIC SPEAKER: I think it's good to be on the  
17 record.

18 MR. CRAVA: Thank you. Jim Crava again; still  
19 opposed to the dam. I heard the term mitigation quite a  
20 bit on the salmon just now. And I'm wondering, we --  
21 we've talked about the salmon are in decline. I would  
22 like an instance where building a dam helped mitigate the  
23 decline of the salmon in the nation.

24 MR. DYOK: In terms of -- of salmon, I don't have  
25 an example. Okay. Pure and simple, I don't. But I'm not

1 knowledgeable about everything on salmon. I will give you  
2 one instance of where a project, you know, did help a  
3 particular, you know, species of trout. And that was in  
4 -- on the Yakagany River where there's a dam on a  
5 tributary. And every few years the water temperature --  
6 the natural temperature heated up, and the flow from that  
7 tributary is relatively small.

8           And the fish could not survive, except for the  
9 ones that could go up to the trips of the -- of the yacht,  
10 and smaller ones; the big ones could not survive. They  
11 devised a system to operate that project in a -- a manner  
12 to operate from 10:00 to 12:00 in the daytime, and that  
13 was able to keep the water temperatures cool enough. Here  
14 we have a system where we have a decline in salmon. And I  
15 would hope that one of the things that we might come up --  
16 our of these studies is to try to better understand the  
17 system a little bit better as to what's causing that  
18 decline.

19           Is it the northern pike? You know, and then  
20 would this project exacerbate the northern pike? Is  
21 something else that we don't know yet. I'm not sure. But  
22 I don't know the answer to that, but I would hope that our  
23 studies would help us understand what the problem is. And  
24 so, for example, if -- if the turbidite -- my -- based on  
25 the studies that I was involved in in the 1980s, we looked

1 at what the turbidite would be.

2 And it would be more like the consistency of the  
3 Kenai River during the summertime, because you settle all  
4 the particles. And it's very analogous. We studied, the,  
5 you know, the Eklutna, you know, Lake. And we ran our  
6 models on Eklutna Lake. And then we ran the same models,  
7 it was called the diversion model. We ran that same model  
8 on the Susitna-Watana -- or on -- actually at that time on  
9 Watana. And so we calculated what the turbidite would be.  
10 And we said, that's what it would -- that's what we expect  
11 it to be.

12 I think someone said, well, you don't really have  
13 the before or the after the case here; and that's true.  
14 And that's where I think some of the risk comes in in  
15 terms of the studies. But if that were the case, and we  
16 understood what the drivers were, maybe there's a way we  
17 could actually help. And Tom Harris, who's with  
18 Knik/Ahtna, talks about revitalizing, you know, the  
19 salmon. And I think it's partly us working together to  
20 understand what's causing the problem of decline.

21 You know, clearly we haven't really done a lot in  
22 that basin in the last 25 year. There isn't any  
23 particular development that you could look at -- that I  
24 could point to that says, this is causing the decline.  
25 And I just don't know, but that's something that we need

1 to understand. And if we could figure out what that is,  
2 maybe we could do something about it.

3 On the Walaman River they had a problem with  
4 getting the salmon and steelhead, you know, downstream.  
5 We put our heads together with the Fish and Wildlife  
6 Service and we came up with a better way. And they  
7 implemented that, and it's a very effective, you know,  
8 system of getting it past a -- Walaman Falls, about a 30  
9 or 40-foot waterfalls there. And they were having a lot  
10 of mortalities. Partly because they had a smaller 12-foot  
11 weir, fish were going over that weir, and not being  
12 killed, but being stunned and then getting picked off by  
13 the birds and other predators in the water.

14 But we understood the system, what was the  
15 problem, and then we were able to come up with a solution.  
16 That's what I'm suggesting here, is that as we do the  
17 studies, maybe we might find something here that helps us  
18 go forward. And look at it -- I mean, there's -- as I  
19 said, I can't do anything about the pristine. And I feel  
20 a lot; and the gentleman that talked about his canoe trip  
21 or his boat trip down, I could visualize all that, because  
22 I've flown up that river system, you know, an awful lot.  
23 And I understand the value that has to people.

24 But somebody else would have to make, you know,  
25 that particular decision. But if the salmon itself, if we

1 can do something to make it better, then that might be an  
2 option, you know, for us. Just the same thing as I tell  
3 people with the climate change issue. That if you have  
4 the opportunity to manage a system, and I don't know what  
5 that management is, then maybe you can do something about  
6 it. But if you don't have any mechanism for managing it,  
7 then there's nothing you can do about it.

8           Those are things that I think as we, you know,  
9 work together, maybe there's opportunities here; maybe we  
10 learn something; at the end of the day, it's really going  
11 to be the State of Alaska that determines its future. And  
12 I appreciate that you are a very knowledgeable group here  
13 today, and have the ability to voice your concerns very  
14 effectively; not only to FERC; but to other people within  
15 the state who are the State decision-makers too.

16           MS. WOOD: So I just wanted to follow up -- oh,  
17 Ruth Wood, with a question that -- because I look around  
18 the room and I see -- and we have a lot of knowledge  
19 that's -- that's not necessarily scientific or -- and I  
20 mean, when I said that in my comments, I really cannot  
21 design a study. But I know that you need to look at  
22 crossing the Susitna to get to the Yentna.

23           You need to look at all those people with all  
24 those cabins over there. And it's -- and you need to look  
25 at the Alexander Creek and Lake Creek, not just -- which

1 flow into Yentna, not -- which then flows into the  
2 Susitna. So how -- how can I know that that's actually  
3 going to be studied? And how can I propose it in a way  
4 that will make you do it? Because I can't -- I do not  
5 have the knowledge to write what you ask for.

6 MR. TURNER: I can certainly appreciate that.  
7 And it's a common problem that we've heard from a lot of  
8 lay people about explaining their concerns, but you've  
9 done that in the sense of trying to relay the issue to us.  
10 And you're right, it does fall now into our hands as -- as  
11 agencies; and I don't mean just the Commission, but others  
12 that -- like the Park Service and the State and others who  
13 have the expertise to design study around the issue. But  
14 that's the first key is to understand the issue.

15 And then we can take it from there in terms of  
16 developing that. But it doesn't permit you from asking,  
17 and say, we need a study to do X, Y, and Z. And at least  
18 gives us the foundation to understand better the issue, if  
19 we haven't picked it up already; and what you think needs  
20 to be looked at in that issue. So -- and then you'll know  
21 if we adopt it or not -- but looking at AEA's proposed  
22 study plan that they put together.

23 And if it's not clear, come to the meetings where  
24 we're working those things out and talk about it and see  
25 if that -- we can resolve those questions. And hopefully

1 that'll be done, and we'll produce a revised study plan.  
2 And if it's still not there, you can tell us; and the  
3 Commission will ultimately look at it. And we if agree  
4 that it's still not there, then we can modify the study  
5 plan accordingly.

6 PUBLIC SPEAKER: And what's the time line for  
7 that with the new change?

8 MR. TURNER: It's basically the same time line  
9 that we've laid out, but about a month later.

10 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Everything will be --

11 PUBLIC SPEAKER: So it telescopes out, and the  
12 initial study plan that was due in June, is that still  
13 gonna be due in --

14 PUBLIC SPEAKER: July.

15 PUBLIC SPEAKER: July.

16 MR. TURNER: Basically July, we'd back up --

17 PUBLIC SPEAKER: So the dates don't keep being --

18 MR. TURNER: Okay. Those are the dates. So  
19 basically projected out by a month. Now, what we will do,  
20 if -- when we grant this -- in scoping Document 2 we'll  
21 consider all the input. We'll put in another process  
22 plan. If you look at the back of the scoping document,  
23 there is a process plan of all the due dates that are in  
24 there. We'll adjust those, so you can better comprehend  
25 that. But just for now, think about it as about a month

1 difference.

2 PUBLIC SPEAKER: And when does Scoping Document 2  
3 come out?

4 MR. TURNER: Scoping Document 2 comes out in --  
5 where'd it go?

6 PUBLIC SPEAKER: June 11th.

7 MR. TURNER: June 11, yeah. If right now it says  
8 June 11th, so it'd go to July.

9 PUBLIC SPEAKER: July 11th.

10 MR. TURNER: The Scoping Document 2 comes out at  
11 the same time that AEA produces their study plan --  
12 proposed study plan, box 6.

13 MR. DYOK: Wayne Dyok. Ruth, and I'm sorry, I  
14 think I might have called you Mary before; I apologize.  
15 What we're -- I've been taking meticulous notes, and I  
16 know my staff that's here have been taking notes too. So  
17 our goal is to -- so our goal is to reflect the comments  
18 that we hear and the study plans that we're going. We're  
19 already challenging our consultants to deal with those  
20 study plans. And I think I said earlier, I don't  
21 necessarily have to do what -- what FERC requires us to do  
22 is the minimum.

23 The -- one of the gentlemen that talked about the  
24 glacier -- I'm not sure that FERC would require us to do  
25 that. You could ask David, you know, FERC's thought on

1 that. But I've already signed an RSA with GGS and the  
2 University of Fairbanks to undertake a study of glacial,  
3 you know, true melt. So we don't -- we're not stuck with  
4 doing only what FERC asks us to do. So we want to do what  
5 we think is the right thing within the state.

6 We had discussions internally with State  
7 organizations, and that was a recommended study that we  
8 should do; so we've embarked on that. I've heard you, you  
9 know, loud and clear. And I've -- our board is pretty  
10 reasonable here in terms of trying to do the studies. You  
11 know, when they hired me, one of the things that I said  
12 was, that we're gonna look at this in -- and turn over all  
13 the stones that we need to take. We're gonna take it as  
14 far as we need to in an evaluation.

15 Not just say, okay, we're stopping the studies at  
16 the confluence of the Talkeetna, Chulitna, and Susitna  
17 River. But where we need to, we'll go all the way down to  
18 Cook Inlet.

19 MR. SOUSA: Yeah, Gerald Sousa here. One place  
20 to start on the Cook Inlet is Alexander Creek. Where once  
21 there were 8- to 12,000 kings returning which resulted in  
22 a multi-million dollar sportfishery, this last few years  
23 with closures have been reduced to maybe 70 to 30 kings  
24 returning to those. As being a member of the Mat-Su  
25 Advisory Council, which is responsible to going through

1 Fish & Game Regulations for the State of Alaska, one of 80  
2 boards in the state.

3 The proposals have varied from open netting to  
4 using dynamite on Alexander Creek to get rid of the pike  
5 population. Now, with the warming of the water in the  
6 Susitna, plus the reduced flow rate, as well as that  
7 Susitna water flowing towards -- pushing the Talkeetna  
8 water, creating clear water down for several miles; pike  
9 most likely will be introduced up into this area; and  
10 there will not be a fish that will be able to survive  
11 this. So I want to add that to your study. Thank you.

12 MS. MANNING: I'll make this really short. My  
13 name is Andrea Manning. I'm very a short-timer here in  
14 Talkeetna, so I don't have a lot to add. Except that I do  
15 want to clarify some numbers on tourism. The new numbers  
16 for 2011 were just released by the State of Alaska. We  
17 had 205,000 visitors in Talkeetna last year. I think it's  
18 important that those numbers be accurate.

19 MR. DYOK: Thank you.

20 MR. TURNER: Is there anybody else that has  
21 anything, comments, questions that --

22 MR. LUTTRELL: I'll say one more thing. Max  
23 Luttrell again. Looking at the map over there and I saw  
24 around -- gentleman that came here and he had a radio on  
25 his belt. He might be Harbor Fire Department or

1 something. As far as commanding patrol -- accident -- if  
2 an accident does occur at that dam site, you'll run a road  
3 from Park up to that dam, because everything's gonna be  
4 coming down that river.

5 You're not going to come up from Cantwell and get  
6 up and look over the dam at that and look and say, yeah,  
7 we need to get down there. It's not going to happen.  
8 You're going to need a road from Parks up through that --  
9 to the dam. So if does break away, he -- a rescue squad  
10 can get up the road to get to him. And, you know,  
11 hopefully that'll never happen again. And it's sort of  
12 pretty funny that we're leaning all the way to Cantwell,  
13 taking a right, going 30, 40 miles, and cutting back in  
14 about 30, 40 miles, when an 18-wheeler gets four miles to  
15 the gallon at the most, fully loaded.

16 MR. TURNER: Is there anyone else that wanted to  
17 make a statement? We kind of already went through these  
18 dates, so I'll -- unless anybody has any other questions,  
19 I will echo Wayne's comments. We do appreciate your  
20 coming tonight; I understand the passion and your values  
21 you place on your -- on the ecosystems and the resources  
22 out here and your livelihoods. And -- depend on those.

23 It is not a done deal for the Commission as well.  
24 We're at an early, early, early, part in the stage here.  
25 We're trying to understand what we need to look at, and

1       this has been very helpful and enlightening. And we will  
2       do that, and we will gather the information necessary to  
3       -- to analyze the effects, so -- with that, I -- thank you  
4       again for your participation tonight, and welcome your  
5       comments. And, remember, you can always file written  
6       comments by May 31st so -- thank you.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25