

1 FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
2 PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING FOR
3 SUSITNA-WATANA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT
4

5 Held at:
6 Westmark Hotel & Conference Center
7 813 Noble Street
8 Fairbanks, Alaska
9

10 March 29, 2012

11 6:02 p.m.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

1 KIM NGUYEN: Welcome everyone to the
2 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's public
3 scoping meeting for the Susitna-Watana
4 Hydroelectric Project, project number 14241.

5 My name is Kim Nguyen. I'm a civil
6 engineer with the Commission in the division of
7 hydropower licensing. I will be working along
8 with David Turner, the project coordinator on
9 licensing of this project. With us today from
10 the FERC team is Ms. Jennifer Hill who is the
11 chief of the northwest branch of hydropower
12 lining. Jesse Fernandes who's our land and rec
13 planner. And then back to Frank Winchell who
14 will be doing archaeological and cultural
15 resources.

16 Before we open the meeting up for
17 public comments we have a brief presentation to
18 help everyone know what will be happening over
19 the next several years with the relicensing --
20 with the licensing of this proposed project.
21 We'll start off with an overview of the licensing
22 process, the purpose of the scoping meeting
23 tonight. Then we will have Wayne Dyok from the
24 Alaska Energy Authority, the applicant, briefly
25 describe the proposed project and its operation.

1 Following AEA's presentation, we will go over a
2 list of the resource issues that the Commission
3 staff have identified based on the
4 pre-application document and the record for the
5 project. Then we will turn the floor over to you
6 for your comments and questions about the
7 project. To wrap up we will review some key
8 dates and milestones in the immediate future.
9 Then we'll see if there are any additional
10 questions before adjourning.

11 If you would like to provide oral
12 comments today, please make sure you sign in in
13 the back of the room. There are also copies of
14 Scoping Document 1 on this presentation on those
15 stables over there.

16 This scoping meeting is being
17 transcribed and will be made part of the
18 Commission's record. So before speaking, please
19 state your name and affiliation so the court
20 reporter can attribute comments to you.

21 You can also file written comments
22 and study requests whether or not you choose to
23 speak today. For those who wish to be on the
24 FERC's official mailing list -- and this is
25 different from the sign-in sheet that you have in

1 the back of the room -- there are instructions on
2 page 28 of the Scoping Document 1 for you to do
3 this.

4 Finally, we recommend that you go to
5 our Web page at FERC.gov to eSubscribe to the
6 project. And all you need to do is put in the
7 project number, 14241, and you -- in doing this
8 you will be notified of all submittals and
9 issuances related to this project.

10 Okay. This is a broad overview of
11 the integrated licensing process. AEA filed
12 their notice of intent, or NOI, and
13 pre-application document, or PAD, back in
14 December of 2011. We are now in the scoping
15 phase which is box number 2.

16 Over the next several months we will
17 all be working together to finalize study plans,
18 which is the third and fourth boxes. Once we
19 have an approved study plan, AEA will implement
20 the study and begin developing a licensing
21 application. There will be at least a couple of
22 opportunities for you to review and modify the
23 approved study plans. If all goes according to
24 AEA's proposed schedule, the final license
25 application will be filed sometime in September

1 of 2015. At that time staff will review the
2 application for adequacy, and if it's complete,
3 we will then issue an REA notice, or ready for
4 environmental assessment -- analysis, excuse me,
5 requesting comments, terms and conditions and
6 interventions. We will then prepare and issue a
7 draft and final environmental impact statement or
8 EIS.

9 This is a more detailed look at our
10 pre-filing activities. As you will notice, one
11 major aspect of the IOP, that it is a very
12 schedule driven process which provides certainty
13 to all when things are going to happen.

14 Right now we're at box number 4,
15 scoping. We are seeking your inputs to issues
16 that should be addressed and study you believe
17 necessary to address those issues. Those
18 comments and study requests must be filed with
19 the Commission by April the 27th, 2012. I note
20 however that there have been several
21 extension-of-time requests for the filings of
22 these comments and study requests. Although we
23 have not acted on that, we will most probably be
24 granting the 30-day extension. So then that
25 means those comments will be due May the 31st.

1 Based on that extension-of-time request, all of
2 the dates that you see here will probably be
3 pushed back about a month.

4 Box 11, 12 and 13, the ones in the
5 yellow boxes, are necessary only if a mandatory
6 conditioning agency asks the Commission to
7 reconsider studies that we did not require. Box
8 14 and 15 covers the study implementation period.
9 And 16 and 17 are steps associated with preparing
10 of the draft and final EIS.

11 Under the Federal Power Act, FERC has
12 the responsibility to issue licenses for all
13 nonfederal hydroelectric projects. The Natural
14 Environmental Policy Act requires disclosure of
15 environmental effects of FERC's licensing
16 actions. We intend to prepare an EIS for this
17 project as I've said.

18 The scoping document that was issued
19 in February includes a brief description of the
20 existing project facilities, a preliminary list
21 of resource issues, studies that are proposed by
22 AEA and a pre-filing process schedule, which is
23 also in Appendix A of your scoping document one.

24 The purpose of this meeting is to
25 solicit comments and inputs about issues that

1 need to be considered or not considered in the
2 EIS, specifically we want to talk about the
3 issues we identified, make sure we understand the
4 issues you raise, and ensure that we did not omit
5 any issue that should've been included, and
6 further refine or eliminate any identified issue.
7 We also want to begin talking about what
8 information is needed to address these issues.

9 The scoping document also describes
10 the type of information we are seeking as part of
11 scoping. This includes information that will
12 help us identify significant issues and the
13 geographic and temporal scope of the analysis
14 needed to address those issues. The information
15 that would help describe existing environment and
16 the project effects, information on any other
17 developmental activities in the area affected by
18 the proposed project, and identification of any
19 issues that we might have identified that are not
20 an issue or don't require a detailed analysis,
21 and any studies that you believe are needed to
22 address this issue.

23 In addition to commenting on the
24 issues to be addressed in the EIS, that is also a
25 time for you to submit study requests to help AEA

1 and the commission understand what information
2 you expect to be gathered and how to ensure that
3 any such studies are needed to address an issue.
4 Each study request must address seven criteria.
5 And this is also in your scoping document one.
6 Following these criteria will formulate -- help
7 us formulate a well-structured and informed
8 request that can help us focus discussions on the
9 merit and applicability of the studies.

10 Again, the comments on the scoping
11 document, the PAD and any study requests must be
12 submitted by April 27th or May 31st if we grant
13 the extension. All filings must identify the
14 project's name and number and should be filed
15 with the secretary of the Commission. Her
16 address is listed here and also in your scoping
17 document. Filings can made electronically or be
18 mailed in. We recommend you electronically file
19 your documents to make sure that it gets in
20 proper time and to reduce your mailing costs.

21 So before we get to the issues, to
22 make sure we all understand why we're here today,
23 I want to turn it over to Wayne Dyok from AEA to
24 give you a brief overview of the project
25 facilities and its operations.

1 WAYNE DYOK: Thank you, Kim. For the
2 record, my name is Wayne Dyok, D-Y-O-K. I'm the
3 Alaska Energy Authority's project manager for the
4 Susitna-Watana Project.

5 Good evening, everyone. I want to
6 thank you all for coming here tonight to express
7 your thoughts on the issues that need to be
8 evaluated. This is the Commission's meeting, but
9 we here at AEA are also here to listen to you, to
10 understand the issues that are important to you
11 so that we can do a thorough job of addressing
12 them in our license application to FERC.

13 I'm going to just give a brief
14 overview of the project. There's quite a few
15 people here so I want to make sure we have plenty
16 of time for you to talk about the issues.

17 First of all, the project is located
18 184 miles above the mouth of the Susitna River
19 and that's upstream of Devil's Canyon. And I'm
20 sure you all know where Devil's Canyon is, living
21 here. But a key part of this is that the Devil's
22 Canyon acts as a barrier to most salmon coming
23 upstream. Just the king salmon can make it
24 upstream. So we're going to be conducting
25 studies to look at that. But we're also very

1 interested in the effects of the project on all
2 the salmon and resident fish, you know, even
3 downstream from Devil's Canyon because the
4 project does have the potential to affect those.

5 We're looking at building the project
6 probably in the order 700 to 800 feet; in the
7 pre-application document, we showed a dam height
8 of 700. But we're also studying very intently,
9 you know, higher elevations. And ultimately the
10 elevation could be as high as 885 feet. I'll
11 talk about that a little bit. Reservoir itself
12 will be about 39 miles long with the 700 foot
13 high dam. And if you go to a 800 foot high dam
14 it gets a little bit longer, probably on the
15 order of 43 miles long. And it's approximately
16 two miles wide at its widest point, but it's
17 actually a relatively narrow reservoir.

18 The capacity that we're looking at is
19 nominally around 600 megawatts. We're evaluating
20 whether we could put in three 200-megawatt units
21 or four 150-megawatt units or maybe even a little
22 bit less than that. But those studies are
23 certainly still ongoing and it all depends on how
24 it ties into the system and we need to have a
25 stable electric, you know, grid out there.

1 The project itself as currently
2 configured will generate around 2.5 million
3 megawatt hours. And if you're like me it
4 probably means very little. But when you think
5 about the Railbelt system using around
6 5.4 million megawatt hours annually, you can put
7 that in context. It's almost half of the actual
8 average annual energy that we use within the --
9 electrical range that we use within the rail
10 belt. So it is pretty substantial from an
11 electrical energy perspective.

12 One thing that's very important to
13 the utilities who are going to be taking this
14 power is making sure we have reliable energy
15 during the wintertime when we need it most. So
16 in 49 out of 50 years, that's 98 percent
17 reliability. We can average a minimum of 250
18 megawatts. The average over that winter would be
19 more but a minimum -- that's the minimum that we
20 could get would be 250 megawatt. And I'll talk a
21 little bit about how that might be generated, in
22 one of my further slides.

23 I'm going to start at a high level
24 and kind of zoom into the project. So first of
25 all, I mentioned the reservoir right here. If we

1 have the 700-foot high dam, that would be the
2 upstream extent. If we go to a 800-foot high
3 dam, it would be somewhere around here, a few
4 miles longer.

5 We're considering three access
6 corridors at this point. Within one of those
7 corridors we would have a road and a transmission
8 line, and we're considering putting in a
9 transmission line in one of the other two
10 corridors. And the first one comes off the Parks
11 Highway and goes along the Denali Highway
12 approximately 20 miles and then goes, you know,
13 south 44 miles to the project site. You see it
14 bifurcating ing here. One of these, this one,
15 would be the access road itself and this one
16 would be the transmission line route. The
17 transmission line route would be a little easier
18 to site and construct, but it's more
19 environmentally sensitive. We wouldn't be
20 affecting as much wetland areas if we took this
21 route. This one is little bit more substantive
22 but it avoids sensitive environmental areas.

23 Then we have what we call the
24 Chulitna corridor. It runs from the Alaska
25 Railroad east to the project site. That's

1 45 miles long. And then we have the Gold Creek
2 corridor which also runs from the Alaska Railroad
3 east to the project site. And, again, we have
4 the same situation here that we do up here where
5 this one would be the transmission line to the
6 north, and the southern part here would be the
7 road to avoid some of the real steep gullies that
8 would be very expensive to traverse.

9 Okay. Now we're zooming in on the
10 project site. Here's the dam. This is the
11 reservoir, kind of a larger version of it with
12 the reservoir full. You can sort of see in the
13 background here, this is the natural river flow,
14 in sort of the blue. Those of you that sat up
15 front get to see that. The ones of you that sat
16 back further, that might be a little more
17 challenging.

18 The project would have a work force
19 of approximately 800 people over the seven year
20 construction. So we need to have a camp for
21 them. But the peak of the work force will
22 probably be more like a thousand people. Once
23 the project is completed this will be dismantled
24 and we would have a permanent camp here housing
25 maybe 20 to 30 people that we would need to

1 operate the project.

2 We need an airstrip. So put one
3 there. And then you need burrow areas and quarry
4 areas to build the dam. And the closer you can
5 get to the dam, the better off you're going to be
6 to lower the costs. This line, this redder line
7 here is the 2,200-foot contour. And here it
8 outlines the access roads as they come into the
9 area. And that's the area that we're going to be
10 intently studying. We're going to study outside
11 that but we're getting into some very detailed
12 study within that.

13 This is a conceptual site plan
14 looking down on the facility. This is the dam
15 here, just to kind of orient you. You need to
16 have access. That's the first thing you have to
17 have before you can, you know, build the project.
18 So we have to build the road. So we're kind
19 of -- sequentially you have to have a series of
20 roads here to get access to the different areas.
21 So all these light gray areas are your road
22 system to gain access.

23 So once you gain access, then the
24 first thing you're going to do after that is you
25 got to build your diversion tunnel. And that's

1 this right here. Once you get that done, because
2 you have to maintain continuous flow in the
3 river, you can start putting the water through
4 the diversion tunnel here. And then once you do
5 that, then you can put your diversion -- upstream
6 diversion dam here and your downstream diversion
7 dam here. And then as I said, this is the main,
8 you know, dam.

9 We're considering, you know, three
10 kinds of dams. A roller compacted concrete dam
11 which has been around for a while but only in the
12 last 25 years has it really taken off. And
13 there's been quite a few of these RCC, as we call
14 them, dams that have been built around the world.
15 Some fairly large ones around the world, not as
16 large in the U.S., but certainly some in very
17 cold climates as well. The second kind of dam
18 that we're looking at is the kind of dam that was
19 considered in the 1980s, which is rock-fill
20 clay-core dam. That requires an awful lot of
21 material though. And then the third kind is a
22 concrete faced rock-filled dam. And for those of
23 you that might be familiar with the Bradley Lake
24 project on the Kenai River, that's the kind of
25 dam that was built there.

1 We haven't made a final decision yet
2 on the kind of dam that's going to be, but
3 indications are pointing to this because it's
4 quicker to construct and it requires, you know,
5 less material, ergo, you know, less construction
6 costs.

7 So we've got the power house a little
8 bit further downstream than you would normally
9 have. And the reason for that is that would
10 allow us to raise the height of the dam at any
11 point in the future to its ultimate maximum
12 without disrupting the current operation. So
13 everything would be, you know, put in place here
14 and then you could -- you would be building on
15 the back side of the dam, We could raise it up to
16 a total height of 885 feet which is the maximum
17 height that you could actually achieve.

18 Now let's talk for a moment about how
19 the project might operate. First of all, what
20 you're trying to do here, as I said earlier,
21 you're trying to have as much energy generation
22 in the wintertime as possible. So that means
23 you -- we have a lot more flow in the summertime
24 so you want to capture the runoff during the
25 summertime. So you have the snow melt, that's

1 probably going to start late April, maybe early
2 May. So you want to capture as much of that.
3 And then you fill the reservoir from its lowest
4 point at that point during the summertime, so you
5 get that snow melt. Then you get the glacial
6 melt and then you get the rain fall run off from
7 the storms that pass through, so that by the time
8 you get to the fall you want to have your
9 reservoir to its maximum point.

10 And we're looking at drawdowns,
11 water-level changes that may be anywhere from --
12 in a worst case year -- from 150 to 200 feet of
13 drawdown. In some years we won't go down that
14 much, but that's what we're studying right now is
15 as much as 200 feet, but probably more likely,
16 you know, in the 150 feet. So that's the general
17 annual operation.

18 Now let's look at how we might
19 operate on a daily base. There's two types of
20 operations that we're considering for the
21 project, and we may likely end up someplace in
22 between those or one of those two. That will
23 depend on the environmental flows that are being
24 required. The way we're initially looking at
25 this, we're looking at the environmental flows

1 that were identified in the 1980s. A fair amount
2 of work was done in the 1980s on developing
3 environmental flows. So at Gold Creek in the
4 summer, for example, the thought was to provide
5 around 9,000 cubic feet of flow in the
6 summertime. And there's -- during an average
7 summer month right now you probably have about
8 23,000 cubic feet of flow, so we'd be trying to
9 save that water in the summertime to release it
10 in the wintertime. And we have to do
11 environmental studies to update the work that was
12 done and really understand the system. And then
13 we'll be working with the resource agencies to
14 come up with what we think the best flow would
15 be.

16 So let's go now fast forward and
17 assume that the project is built. How might it
18 operate on a typical day? Here's January, 2025.
19 So we've estimated what the energy needs would be
20 in 2025. And here you see the number of
21 megawatts that we would need in the Railbelt.
22 And this, the hours of the day. From 1:00 a.m.
23 to midnight. So midnight you're -- you know,
24 most people are, you know, asleep and so you
25 don't have a huge demand, but there is still a

1 significant amount of demand. And then people
2 start waking up in the morning, turning on
3 appliances and lights. And you have a peak
4 around breakfast time. Then everybody goes off
5 to work and you have lots of needs during the
6 workday, but maybe not as much as the breakfast
7 peak. And then during the evening hours people
8 are coming home and they're turning on their
9 electric ranges and whatnot and lights. And so
10 you have, you know, the high peak of the day.
11 And then people retire and the cycle repeats
12 itself the next day.

13 So we need to make sure we meet that
14 need, you know, Golden Valley Electric, for you,
15 would be, you know, meeting their percentage of
16 that need and they have to do it on a
17 instantaneous basis. So one operation that we're
18 talking about is called load following which
19 means you follow the load. So we've idealized
20 that and said, okay, in this particular day all
21 the other generation that we have in the system
22 amounts to this amount. So you might have some.
23 Wind and you might have some combustion turbines.
24 You might have other renewables in the system.
25 You might have Healy Clean Coal, whatever. All

1 that. And it would have some flexibility, but
2 we're saying let's look at kind of a worst case
3 for how Susitna-Watana might operate in the load
4 following. So that means Susitna-Watana has to
5 operate all the rest. They have to fill in that
6 amount of energy.

7 So the amount of average -- the
8 maximum amount of flow that we get for 600
9 megawatts -- I know these are a lot of numbers
10 that I'm throwing at you but trying to make it
11 relevant to your thought process. So the maximum
12 amount of flow that you get through the units
13 with 600 megawatts is 14,500 CFS. So let's just
14 round it to 15,000. Okay. So here we're going
15 from about 800 to about 400. So that's roughly
16 two-thirds of that or 10,000 in this particular
17 case. 10,000 cubic feet per second. Here it's a
18 little less than a couple of hundred, you know,
19 megawatts. So maybe we're at 4,000 CFS. So we'd
20 be varying the flows in this particular case from
21 4,000 to 10,000 CFS over the day to meet that,
22 you know, energy need.

23 And if a unit were to go down in the
24 system -- so let's say a combustion turbine goes
25 down in Anchorage, then this project has the

1 ability to meet that extra 200-megawatt load by
2 adding on another unit. And if this -- which
3 would mean this would drop down here by 200
4 megawatts and then we'd be operating at the full
5 600 megawatts of capacity.

6 So that's one mode of operation. But
7 there may be environmental issues associated with
8 that. And we need to study that. And that's a
9 big effort for us as we go forward with the
10 studies to look at the effect of that.

11 The other kind of operation is to
12 flip this around and say well let's keep the
13 flows constant coming out of the dam. So we use
14 other kinds of generation to meet this energy,
15 and then we -- this amount here with the straight
16 line, say, around the 300 or 250 here would be
17 what we would produce. And that's called base
18 loading energy. And that's the other extreme.

19 So we're studying that. We're
20 studying the load following. And we're studying
21 someplace in between. We need to look at what
22 the economics of that, the Railbelt utilities
23 have told us they want a lot of flexibility. And
24 to be able to operate in load following gives
25 them flexibility but there may be environmental

1 constraints.

2 So in a nutshell that's a quick
3 synopsis. I will be around afterwards or if we
4 take a break to answer any questions that you
5 might have on the project. And now I guess we
6 turn it back to FERC to hear from you.

7 KIM NGUYEN: Thank you Wayne. So if you
8 look in section 4.2 of the Scoping Document 1,
9 starting on pages 11 through 17, we have listed
10 an exhaustive list of environmental issues that
11 we would analyze in the EIS. This list is not
12 intended to be exhaustive or final, however, but
13 is an initial listing of the issues that we have
14 identified and could be potentially significant.

15 We're particularly interested in
16 hearing from you to see if we have captured all
17 the issues or whether we have some to be added or
18 some can be eliminated. So with that said,
19 without taking anymore of your time, we'll have
20 the list of issues up. So please come up to the
21 podium. Remember to state your name and
22 affiliation before speaking for the court
23 reporter, please.

24 JAMES KARI: I'm James Kari and I'm
25 retired from Alaska Native Language Center. And

1 I didn't really prepare much in advance but I can
2 think of a few things immediately that would be
3 important.

4 I do a lot of work with Ahtna
5 language and I know all of the leadership at
6 Ahtna, Incorporated. And just today Kathryn
7 Martin who's the vice president sent me her
8 statement that she gave at Glennallen last night.
9 And I had nothing to do with the statement. I
10 probably would have made a few suggestions
11 because we know there is an Ahtna geographic
12 names network and it's very interesting to see
13 that it goes beyond, in a downstream direction
14 below -- to about Devil's Canyon. And it's very
15 well documented and is probably the best
16 documented native place names network in Alaska.
17 And I manage the data on that. And we -- Ahtna
18 has -- we try to have some reciprocity about
19 data. And there's a lot of things I could point
20 out about the implications of an aboriginal place
21 names network that's completely within one
22 language and there's no substratum of some
23 non-Athabascan languages. The latest
24 archaeological interpretations of Athabascan
25 continuity minimally goes from time of historic

1 contact to 6,000 years. Now there's plenty of
2 evidence, too, that it's, like, twice as old as
3 that.

4 So just a few things I would -- I
5 would say that the Ahtna statement last night
6 should be phrased stronger. That they realize
7 that the Susitna dam is within their traditional
8 territory, within their traditional language area
9 which is -- this is the western Ahtna dialect.
10 And also I worked extensively with Jake Tansy who
11 died in about 2002, but his knowledge of trails,
12 travel, place names was in a comparable way
13 absolutely world-class.

14 The research that you're going to do
15 shouldn't be perfunctory in what we see. You
16 know, what I've heard about -- I think it was
17 Exxon sponsoring research along the pipeline
18 Al-Can corridor -- from the point of view of
19 contractors that this is cut-and-paste work, it's
20 very perfunctory, it's boring to everybody
21 involved.

22 So you -- and the Ahtna themselves,
23 they've also commented to me, several of the vice
24 presidents and the president, that lots of stuff
25 seems to have gone out for bid and people are

1 doing things that -- on subsistence and stuff and
2 they were not fully informed about being involved
3 in those contracts. And you don't want to get
4 into this stereotype of, we'll go ask the Natives
5 to count ducks or something, that's really in a
6 sense minor compared to the fact that we do know
7 they have 6,000 years of occupation in the area.
8 So I think some type of research that's really
9 good and involves the Ahtna and has educational
10 benefits for them is what we all should be
11 shooting for, keeping in mind that they're
12 pressed staff and labor-wise to do this too. But
13 I don't think we want just perfunctory products.

14 The Jake Tansy texts are monolingual
15 in Ahtna. They're really -- as an individual
16 who's the most thoroughly, rigorously on record
17 about travel and land use.

18 Another thing to keep in mind because
19 there's this business of RS 2477 trails and a
20 wider easement versus a 17(b) easement. And I
21 would not take anything for granted about gravel
22 and so on simply being a state property or
23 something when it's in an area that is not public
24 -- not accessing public lands but accessing areas
25 of a traditional territory that had been

1 continuously occupied and used. And Jake can
2 tell us about it even on his own foot trails up
3 to, say, the 1940s or 1950s. Right around these
4 places -- Suntrana Lake (sic), for example, is
5 (native word) -- Suntrana Creek is (native word).
6 Deadman Creek is (native word). And he knew the
7 whole thing, south side of Susitna too.

8 So anyway I think you should shoot
9 for some high standards on those types of -- in that
10 phase, you know, in the next two to three years when
11 you're doing those types of cultural resource.

12 Also I might add, the archaeology is
13 usually well served. And there's a lot of well
14 qualified people who are already doing that. Maybe
15 some of them are here from northern land use and so
16 on. And they certainly know their stuff. So I
17 think that's probably already well on the way.

18 Thank you.

19 BRIAN NEWTON: Good evening. I'm Brian
20 Newton, president and CEO of Golden Valley.
21 Thank you for coming to Fairbanks and thanks for
22 the opportunity to speak. Looks like we have a
23 fairly large crowd so I may suggest, if you don't
24 mind, maybe taking -- we've got a couple of
25 dignitaries, I know Grier Hopkins is here for

1 Senator Thomas. And we may want to take, maybe,
2 assemblymen as well. And then maybe take the
3 list that we signed up with and go through that
4 order if you don't mind. It just may be more
5 orderly. Just a suggestion.

6 Again, good evening. My name is
7 Brian Newton. I'm the president and CEO of
8 Golden Valley.

9 Golden Valley applauds the efforts of
10 the Federal Regulatory Commission, FERC, to
11 solicit public comments about one of the most
12 critical infrastructure projects ever considered
13 in Alaska, the Susitna-Watana hydroelectric dam.
14 First, let me go on record saying that Golden
15 Valley is unequivocally in favor of a large
16 hydroelectric project like Susitna-Watana
17 hydroelectric project. As one of the Railbelt
18 electric utilities that has already purchased
19 electricity from a hugely successful
20 hydroelectric project, the Bradley Lake
21 hydroelectric dam, we would welcome the
22 opportunity to purchase electricity from
23 Susitna-Watana hydroelectric project.

24 Here's the primary reason Golden
25 Valley is in favor of the Susitna-Watana project:

1 Like the electricity that we purchase from
2 Bradley Lake built in 1992, Susitna will provide
3 our members with stable affordable energy for
4 decades. As Bradley Lake has demonstrated,
5 depending upon the level of state support, the
6 initial cost of hydroelectric power is
7 competitive with existing sources. However, over
8 time the cost of power from conventional sources,
9 like natural gas, coal and oil, rise and the cost
10 of hydroelectricity remains flat. And should
11 Susitna-Watana be state supported and financed
12 similar to Bradley Lake, the cost of power will
13 be extremely stable for the first 50 years as
14 well as for the life of the project. That can't
15 be said for the other forms of energy that we
16 purchase.

17 Today because of Golden Valley's
18 dependence on oil-fired generation, the cost of
19 electricity in Alaska's interior is the highest
20 it's ever been. In fact our average member pays
21 almost \$170 a month for electricity. What GVA
22 needs is a lower cost source of fuel like what
23 Susitna-Watana could bring in the future.

24 Let me jump to FERC's role in this
25 process. We call upon FERC for several crucial

1 matters. First, the proposed integrated
2 licensing process in the scoping document remain
3 on schedule. Golden Valley, like other Railbelt
4 utilities must plan well in advance for the
5 electric needs for our members. We use an
6 integrated resource plan, or IRP, to coordinate
7 how much electricity our members need, the
8 resources needed to meet that need, and the time
9 it will take to get the resource online. Failing
10 to plan or, worse yet, not having electricity at
11 50 below zero is simply not acceptable.
12 Including Susitna hydro in our IRP means that we
13 are counting on having it online in 2023.
14 Anything that disrupts or postpones this from
15 occurring would cause our members higher costs
16 and concerns that affordable power will not be
17 available when they need it.

18 Second, the FERC should ensure that
19 environmental protection and mitigation measures
20 are fair and not overly burdensome to the extent
21 that they cause the project to be needlessly
22 delayed or inflate the cost. Golden Valley
23 supports environmental regulation that
24 establishes a more coordinated, realistic and
25 cost-effective compliance program. The FERC must

1 provide appropriate flexibility to achieve the
2 desired protection and mitigation while ensuring
3 the project completion in managing overall costs
4 to the ratepayer.

5 Third, the FERC's review of
6 alternatives should focus on energy sources that
7 seek to meet the state's renewable energy goal of
8 having 50 percent of the electricity needs
9 supplied for renewable energy by 2025. Currently
10 Golden Valley is on target to have 20 percent of
11 our peak met by renewable energy before the end
12 of 2012 when we bring the 25 megawatt Eva Creek
13 Project online. With the addition of
14 Susitna-Watana in 2023, Golden Valley could not
15 only meet but likely exceed the 50 percent
16 renewable energy goal.

17 Also the FERC should also consider
18 alternatives that reduce overall emissions from
19 displacement of fossil fuel such as oil, natural
20 gas and coal. Displacing thermal generation will
21 not only lower emissions but will replace
22 expensive and volatile fuels from our resource
23 mix.

24 Finally, we recognize that under the
25 ILP, integrated licensing process, the level of

1 consultation and collaboration is driven by
2 FERC's schedule and by the application. We
3 believe it is essential for the FERC, the Alaska
4 Energy Authority, and project stakeholders like
5 Golden Valley to utilize tools and methods to
6 ensure studies are properly conducted in a manner
7 that seeks stakeholder input, public comment and
8 Commission oversight without creating unnecessary
9 delays or cost overruns.

10 The FERC has a critical role in this
11 process and must step forward to ensure that the
12 project remains on schedule, environmental
13 measures are not burdensome or costly,
14 alternative sources consider renewable energy and
15 studies are timely and collaborative. Golden
16 Valley commends the work that AEA has done on the
17 pre-application document. And we stand ready to
18 engage in the scheduled work meetings and other
19 ideas and other meetings, less formal,
20 opportunities to influence and enhance the
21 integrated licensing process.

22 I would like to thank the Commission
23 for holding the scoping meeting in Fairbanks and
24 its attention to these crucial matters and for
25 the opportunity to offer comment.

1 Thank you.

2 LUKE HOPKINS: Fairbanks North Star Bureau
3 Mayor Luke Hopkins here speaking about Fairbanks
4 issues, our community issues that we have.

5 You just heard from Golden Valley and
6 the comment concerning stay on schedule.
7 Should've brought the advertisement from the
8 1950s about "we're about to get gas here" which
9 deals with our energy. We're still waiting for
10 that. Schedule is incredibly important and the
11 ability to stay on that has to do with how the
12 project gets fitted together with starting out
13 with the FERC issues.

14 On page 20 of your document, I wanted
15 to bring up some of the issues I have with the
16 socioeconomic sections and air quality.

17 The issue of our economy and our
18 economic position here in the community is
19 incredibly slammed by the high cost of energy and
20 how clean that energy is. We have issues with
21 what it costs our families to stay here. This is
22 a direct relationship to what is proposed to be
23 the cost of the electric generation from this
24 project.

25 I see that in here where you speak

1 about the local government structure studies, you
2 speak about the Denali Borough, you speak about,
3 I would assume, the Mat-Su Borough. I don't see
4 the Fairbanks North Star Borough on here. I
5 would ask that you include that. Fairbanks North
6 Star Assembly is the body that has the rules and
7 ability to influence the comprehensive plan that
8 is here in our community, that has been adopted
9 by that assembly which deals with the
10 environmental, social, economic, and energy
11 issues. They're all part of our comprehensive
12 plan. Please bring this before the Fairbanks
13 North Star Borough Assembly.

14 In terms of population, income,
15 housing studies, this all relates back here to
16 Fairbanks North Star Borough. Again, goes back
17 to the cost of energy, what is influencing
18 families and population growth either in a
19 positive way or a negative way. There are many
20 factors that have been put in place that the
21 state of Alaska through funding this project and
22 bringing it forward have attempted to overcome
23 some of these economic issues, that being the
24 cost of energy for our state and what it allows
25 our state to develop.

1 I ask FERC to, again, stay on
2 schedule, consider that as an incredibly
3 important aspect of it. When I saw 2015 to 2017
4 I let out a sigh. It wasn't a sigh of relief, it
5 was a sigh of, gosh, we have a long way to go
6 yet. And I hope that it can stay on schedule and
7 can be speeded up to the extent that you're able
8 to do that.

9 In terms of hydroelectric power, we
10 heard from experts. We see the plan for the dam.
11 When I think of what happened -- what has
12 happened in the Pacific northwest for being able
13 to grow the economy in terms of -- just look at
14 Boeing for example. Now I understand that there
15 were environmental issues when those dams were
16 built. We're smarter now. We can do things
17 differently now. And I think that that's fully
18 capable here. But I want to see that kind of
19 benefit to the interior of Alaska, the three
20 local government areas that you spoke to. And
21 there's other ones that will be affected and
22 benefit from this further south and further to
23 the east.

24 So let me speak now about the air
25 quality, 3.3.10. Same issue I brought forward on

1 the permitting of the HCCP is that it's not just
2 the air quality issues around that project, it's
3 how it affects our community. I'm sure that FERC
4 is aware, and when I was in Washington D.C. met
5 with FERC and discussed those issues about air
6 quality in our community, we have a
7 non-attainment area here. Bringing in clean
8 power, and that's what hydro is, is able to
9 offset to an incredible amount. The energy
10 that's used in our community to provide clean
11 energy here, that then allows us to say in ten
12 years from now -- I know it's a long ways away or
13 longer, but I sure hope not -- that our energy is
14 even cleaner than it has been. The federal
15 regulations we keep seeing ratcheting down,
16 ratcheting down. Health reasons, okay, I see
17 that. But the issue is how do we get clean
18 energy here in our community. This is the way to
19 do it. And if the state has stepped forward with
20 funding I ask that FERC step forward a schedule
21 and process that puts this forward. Air quality
22 in our community is directly affected by this
23 project and the success of this project being
24 brought to completion.

25 We speak about regulations. We deal

1 with regulations every day in our community. And
2 they're usually to the effect of how do we get
3 around these regulations so we can get the
4 advantage for our community in terms of health.
5 Air quality -- how do we get something here? How
6 do we get gas here? How do we get other forms of
7 energy here? How do we conserve energy faster?
8 It all has to do with dollars, but then when you
9 get back to the issue of what are we doing for
10 the energy that we consume, we're burning coal.
11 And we burn coal with -- as far as I know meeting
12 the regulations for that, the current
13 regulations. But as we move -- and we look for
14 ten years down the road, hydroelectric energy for
15 our community is going to be an incredible
16 benefit.

17 I'm concerned there would be a course
18 as is usually considered a no-build option in an
19 EIS process. That worries me a great deal.
20 We've had enough no-builds. We have a whole
21 stack of studies. We've got a lot of stuff that
22 says good idea, kinda, sorta. But we need to get
23 this project moving. We need to be on schedule
24 because the people in our community, the families
25 in our community, the jobs in our community that

1 would be created from this project is a piece
2 relating back to socioeconomic impacts of the
3 positive sense. Our community needs this
4 project. I want to see the FERC process move
5 along quickly and as efficiently as it can also.

6 Thank you for the opportunity to
7 comment.

8 JACK DiMARCHI: Good evening. My name's
9 Jack DiMarchi. I'm from Fairbanks here. I
10 appreciate the opportunity to comment tonight.

11 I'd like to say, first, I very much
12 support the project and think it should be built.
13 I'd just like to highlight a couple of things for
14 your consideration as you've worked through your
15 regulatory process, in particular the EIS.

16 The Alaska Railroad corridor has got
17 a high concentration of private property, largely
18 through a series of state land offerings and
19 older federal land offerings. And in the area
20 between Gold Creek and Chulitna there may be as
21 many as 200 landowners. And there would be some
22 impact on certainly the recreational use of those
23 property owners if either of those two access
24 corridors are utilized. And I think that's in
25 quite strong contrast to the access corridor

1 coming off the Denali Highway which would
2 probably impact few landowners.

3 So when you go through your
4 alternatives analysis and your impact analysis,
5 I'd just like you to make sure that that remains
6 fixed in your mind and that the number of
7 landowners that are going to be impacted by the
8 access route you choose is important to them.

9 Thank you.

10 JIM DODSON: Good evening. I'm Jim
11 Dodson. I'm president of Fairbanks Economic
12 Development Corporation. I appreciate FERC
13 coming to town to listen to our testimony and our
14 concerns.

15 The state of Alaska has wisely
16 established a goal of 50 percent of our electric
17 generation from renewable resources by 2005.
18 This is an ambitious goal particularly when you
19 consider that today 79 percent of our electric
20 generation in the state of Alaska is from fossil
21 fuel. Of those communities that have their
22 electric generation from diesel fuel, over 300 of
23 them are paying rates that severely impact their
24 ability to create jobs, sustain and grow their
25 economy, and provide an adequate quality of life.

1 The Susitna-Watana dam can help solve that
2 problem.

3 Besides the positive economic impacts
4 of Susitna-Watana, the dam can help reduce
5 emissions in the state of Alaska significantly.
6 You've heard from the mayor considering --
7 talking about the air quality issues in
8 Fairbanks. Those are significant issues that we
9 have to address and we have to address soon.

10 With the low negative impacts and the
11 high positive impacts, most Alaskans support the
12 building of Susitna-Watana dam. And we ask FERC
13 to help us complete this project on time and on
14 budget. I appreciate you being here tonight.
15 Thank you for your time.

16 DERIK MILLER: Hello, my name is Derik
17 Miller. I live at 49 Pepperdine Drive, 99709.
18 I'm a lifelong resident of Alaska in the
19 Fairbanks community and I'm employed at the
20 University of Alaska, Fairbanks. I did want to
21 mention before I began that Chancellor Brian
22 Rogers from UAF was here. He had some prepared
23 remarks but he had a prior obligation to go to.
24 So he'll be submitting his remarks written before
25 the deadline.

1 Thank you for you this opportunity to
2 provide public testimony in support of this
3 important statewide energy project and to those
4 communities along the Railbelt.

5 I'm 31 years old. To my nieces and
6 nephews I'm considered an old fogey. To my dad
7 I'm still a young whipper-snapper. I can tell
8 you one thing, and that's that I'm old enough to
9 have heard the stories about the pursuit of this
10 project going back to the 80s when I certainly
11 was a young whipper-snapper. It's a project that
12 I wish the state would've had the foresight and
13 gumption to follow through on, especially after
14 having poured hundreds of millions of dollars to
15 study and evaluate it. I say poured hundreds of
16 millions of dollars into it because until we
17 realize a hydroelectric dam of some sort I can't
18 call it an investment. Investments are things
19 that you usually get a return on.

20 Now I understand the price of oil
21 went down in the mid-'80s. As oil prices fell,
22 the cost of power fell and it no longer made
23 economic sense to build the Susitna dam. So it's
24 not black and white as some diehard advocates may
25 perhaps lead you to believe. Commodity prices

1 change, politics change, markets change, public
2 sentiment changes. I get that. But now look at
3 it us, especially here in Fairbanks.

4 Golden Valley Electric Association
5 who you've heard previously from, our electric
6 cooperative, has an energy portfolio that
7 consists of 37 percent oil, 31 percent natural
8 gas and 28 percent coal. We have oil- and
9 coal-fired power plants in Fairbanks, North Pole
10 and Healy. And the natural gas we buy from
11 Anchorage and is brought up through the
12 inter-tie. Our friends in Anchorage certainly
13 aren't giving us any special deals on that
14 natural gas, by the way. We also get a little
15 hydro from Bradley Lake, but that's brought up
16 through the inter-tie as well and it's not much,
17 about four percent.

18 So oil, 37 percent; natural gas, 31
19 percent; coal, 28 percent; and hydro, 4 percent.
20 I wondered what our energy portfolio might look
21 like today had we built Susitna. I certainly
22 hope it's not something my nieces and nephews
23 have to wonder about when they're old fogeys.

24 I'm excited about this project. I
25 love that once the initial capital to build the

1 dam is paid off, cost of energy comes screaming
2 down. I recall one consultant a few years back
3 suggesting 2 to 3 cents a kilowatt per hour for
4 power once the initial debt is paid off. We
5 won't realize that of course until years after
6 the dam is built and I can't provide you that
7 consultant's name because I don't remember it,
8 but, regardless, it will certainly beat the 21.5
9 cents a kilowatt hour I'm paying now for power
10 generated from gas, oil and coal. And it will
11 certainly beat the price my nieces and nephews
12 will be paying absent this project coming online.

13 Hydro will always be clean and it
14 will eventually be cheap. As you prudently move
15 forward, I urge you and other permitting agencies
16 to not delay the completion of the environmental
17 review and approval of this project. The five
18 years for studies and analysis the FERC process
19 provides is ample time for you to also conduct
20 and complete environmental monitoring work.

21 Again, thank you for your time today
22 and best of luck as you move forward.

23 ROBERT HUFMAN: My name's Robert Huffman.
24 I've probably attended dozens of hearings on
25 Susitna hydro over the years. I'm a former

1 director of the Alaska Power Authority in the
2 days when Susitna was a prime project.

3 We did spend millions of dollars on
4 studies. I believe that the studies were stacked
5 up, why they would almost reach the ceiling in
6 this room. We started a voluntary committee
7 called Susitna Power Now. We had bumper stickers
8 made. These are all 1980s vintage. And I want
9 to leave one of these with you that says "Susitna
10 Makes Sense" dated 1982. Every time you look at
11 that, why, it may remind you to expedite this
12 process.

13 I'm getting along in years and being
14 85 I don't know whether I'm ever going to see the
15 dam thing but I'd sure like to, I've been working
16 on it for an awful long time. Went to Washington
17 D.C. and testified in favor of Susitna at a House
18 subcommittee on it. And we never let it die even
19 though the rug was pulled out from under us when
20 the price of oil went down. Why, myself and a
21 fellow named Irvin Ray try to keep it alive
22 through opinions in the newspapers, letters to
23 the editor. We never let it die. And I'm
24 tickled to death to see the process starting over
25 and hopefully this time it'll bear fruit.

1 And we have a contemporary button
2 now, it says Watana Power Now. So we just made
3 these up and we'll be passing those around. And
4 it's citizens' effort to support the project.
5 And thank you very much.

6 MIKE MUSICK: Good evening. Thanks for
7 offering us this opportunity to talk about the
8 dam. My name is Mike Musick. I'm on the
9 Fairbanks North Star Borough Assembly. I speak
10 for myself.

11 In the early '60s I was a vigorous
12 opponent of the Rampart dam. And at the time I
13 thought nuclear was a better option. Well, in
14 the last 50 years I've changed my mind on both.
15 I understand now the importance of having
16 renewable energy, clean energy and something
17 that's almost infinite. I see the Susitna-Watana
18 dam working well with the wind farm that are
19 recently designed and about to be built in -- oh,
20 I think it's near Ferry. It's called Eva Creek.
21 And when the water isn't flowing, the wind may be
22 blowing so they can work together.

23 I spent the summers of '61 and '62
24 and '63 working between Hurricane Gulch and
25 Denali Park. It was Mt. McKinley in those days.

1 So I got to know that country pretty well. It's
2 beautiful. It's some of the most beautiful
3 country in North America if not the world. So we
4 need to have a light footprint. We have to be
5 especially aware of impacts downstream and
6 upstream. From what I understand about the
7 studies that were done in the '80s I believe we
8 have a pretty good handle on the environmental
9 aspects.

10 So at this point I don't see a game
11 stopper. I think we must move forward. We must
12 do something about the 5- to \$600 million a year
13 that leaves our community to pay for our energy.
14 Most of that money leaves town. So this is not
15 only lowering our electrical bill but it's going
16 to lower a great deal of our overall energy
17 expense, and therefore boost our economy across
18 the board.

19 So I won't repeat what you've heard
20 already. I'm just glad that you're paying
21 attention and hope we move forward.

22 Thank you.

23 JACK WILBUR: I am Jack Wilbur, citizen of
24 the Fairbanks North Star Borough and a local
25 small business owner. My address is 817

1 Lancaster Drive, Fairbanks, Alaska. I thank you
2 for coming to Fairbanks to receive our input on
3 this important project. We urge you to look
4 favorably on it.

5 The interior needs a more affordable
6 and more importantly a cost-stable source of
7 energy. Cost stability of energy supply is an
8 important step in the continued economic
9 development of Alaska. It will lead to a
10 diversification of our economic base.

11 My company, Design Alaska, has been
12 in business in Fairbanks for 55 years. And
13 there's only one way that it's going to continue
14 to be in business for another 50 years: If we
15 diversify our economic base.

16 Hydroelectric power is a sustainable
17 and environmentally friendly source of power and
18 it has the support of the majority of Alaskans.
19 Please do what you can to expedite progress on
20 the project and please do not stand in the way of
21 its development. Sooner is better than later.

22 Thank you.

23 GRIER HOPKINS: Hello. My name is Grier
24 Hopkins. I'm here as a legislative aide for
25 Senator Joe Thomas who represents Fairbanks

1 District D, the northern half of the Fairbanks
2 North Star Borough outside of the city.

3 Senator Thomas back in 2008
4 introduced the original piece of legislation that
5 brought Susitna back to the forefront of the
6 energy discussion. It was Senate Bill 246 at
7 that time. It started the funding to re-evaluate
8 the project and begin looking at it again.
9 Senator Thomas introduced that bill to
10 reinvigorate Alaska's economy because it was
11 constrained at the time by the energy costs that
12 we were seeing and we have seen it continue to
13 grow now.

14 We needed to replace -- we were going
15 to need to replace our generation infrastructure
16 all across the state at a cost of about
17 \$10 billion over the next 20 years. Those costs
18 are fossil fuel -- excuse me. Those generation
19 facility are fossil fuel run.

20 Back in the '80s when we originally
21 had started looking at the Susitna dam and then
22 shelved it was because they found a copious
23 amount of gas in Cook Inlet down in Anchorage and
24 it was about 25 cents per million cubic feet.
25 Today they've seen those costs in Anchorage go up

1 to over \$8 at the home. So that's over a 30-year
2 period but most of that growth's been in the last
3 ten years. Here in Fairbanks we've seen our
4 diesel costs grow even more as many people have
5 spoken to.

6 We do need the source of low cost,
7 stable cost, clean energy here to allow our
8 businesses, allow our economy to plan into the
9 future. And look at what they might be able to
10 do themselves knowing what those costs are going
11 to be, not having to worry about the escalating
12 fossil fuel energy costs, especially on the home
13 front for our families here where many are paying
14 recently 6- to \$900 a month for their electricity
15 bills and between 8- and \$9,000 per year for
16 their home heating costs. All those could be
17 brought down if we were to bring a large amount
18 of power on.

19 Senator Thomas has been a big
20 advocate for looking at the ability to expand a
21 project in the future to allow for further growth
22 along the Railbelt and around all of Alaska by
23 making sure that we don't build the smallest
24 project that we can. So I urge you to look at
25 the ability, as Mr. Dyok said, to build a

1 slighter larger facility that we could grow into
2 as we find those new economies and bring new
3 infrastructure online.

4 Additionally, the project budget as
5 it stands now has incorporated \$287 million for
6 environmental mitigation over the course of the
7 project. That's no small amount even for a long
8 project like this that costs in the neighborhood
9 of 4- to \$4.5 billion. That \$287 million would
10 go a long way. And I urge you to look at how
11 that could work downstream from the dam to make
12 sure that the riparian habitat stays intact, make
13 sure that the terrestrial habitat throughout the
14 region can sustain the continued growth and
15 hunting and fishing opportunities and recreation
16 opportunities.

17 The dam's reservoir could bring
18 recreational opportunities that we don't have
19 anywhere else in the state. A large river -- a
20 large lake like it would produce is not something
21 we have in the interior. We have many smaller
22 facilities. We have -- I believe it's Nancy Lake
23 down in the Mat-Su. We have Chena Lakes up here.
24 We have a number of rivers that people like to
25 use, but it brings something new that would be

1 easily accessible, would be a great opportunity
2 for new businesses to grow and for families to
3 visit. And I urge you to look at those aspects
4 also.

5 Additionally, when you're looking at
6 the economic impact please don't look at just a
7 microscopic level of what it could do to the
8 local industry and the local communities in the
9 areas but more of a macroscopic view. Fairbanks
10 works as a hub for much of the state where
11 supplies and goods fly out to all of rural
12 Alaska. They would not be getting much power
13 from this specific dam, but the offset to the
14 economy and the businesses of the lower cost of
15 doing business here would get passed along to
16 those communities that are some of the most
17 economically stressed in the entire country,
18 being rural Alaska villages where they're paying
19 upwards of \$9 per gallon for much of their fuel
20 and 5 to \$6 for a gallon of milk.

21 I would also like to bring back up
22 the pin this gentleman has here. It's a new pin.
23 That new pin -- the old one was kind of cute. It
24 has a beaver on it for building a dam and said
25 "Build Susitna Now." And that same logo with the

1 beaver on has been around for 30 years but this
2 new pin came from Senator Johnny Ellis' office
3 who's in Anchorage. Senator Ellis is a big fan
4 of pins for his different issues that he likes to
5 support. And this is not an Anchorage centric
6 issue as many of his pins tend to be. This is
7 statewide pin. And even people in Anchorage
8 who've been paying the lowest cost for gas in the
9 country for the last 30 years see the benefit to
10 bring Susitna online. Again, a macroscopic view
11 and a macroscopic approach because they
12 understand the impact this will have on the
13 statewide level.

14 Back in 2010, as Brian Newton of
15 Golden Valley Electric Association said, the
16 legislature passed unanimously in both bodies, in
17 the House and the Senate, House Bill 306 which
18 was sponsored by the energy committee that
19 established the goal of having a 50 percent
20 renewable energy grid by 2025. It might be a
21 small token but the unanimous approval by the
22 legislature definitely shows its statewide view.
23 And the Railbelt integrated resource plan which
24 came out in that same year from some of the
25 funding that came, said the only way to get to

1 that 50 percent renewable goal is through a large
2 scale hydroelectric project. The only way that
3 we can do it. That would set us at the forefront
4 of what this country's trying to do in terms of
5 bringing new green power online, new clean power.
6 And we might be a small grid compared to the rest
7 of the country but that goal would go a long way
8 towards what our country needs.

9 That's just about all the notes I
10 have. I thank you again for coming up here. If
11 you guys have any questions contact me. And I
12 appreciate the opportunity for coming to town.

13 Thank you very much.

14 STEVEN HAAGENSON: My name is Steven
15 Haagenson. I'm representing myself tonight. In
16 my past life I was the CEO and president of
17 Golden Valley Electric Association. I retired in
18 2007. And about four months later was appointed
19 to be the statewide energy coordinator and the
20 executive director for Alaska Energy Authority.
21 So I'd like to thank you for this opportunity to
22 talk about Susitna. It's been -- I've been
23 involved in it ever since I was a young engineer.
24 And much like Bob Huffman -- I used to work for
25 Bob Huffman. And it's a critical project. So

1 I'll talk about Alaska first.

2 Alaska is really truly blessed with
3 resources. Every place you look there's a
4 resource. There's neat things around us. It's
5 all around us. That blessing comes with a curse.
6 And the curse is long distance and low usage.
7 And it'll almost cripple the economics of
8 anything to get some kind of assistance or some
9 kind of a vision to move forward with. So
10 tonight I'd like to talk about three areas of the
11 Susitna-Watana Project. Location, need and
12 opportunity.

13 The location is perfect. It's
14 between the two largest load centers in Alaska.
15 I don't know if it's in the middle, I don't know
16 the distance but it's right in the middle. The
17 only way you could make it better would be either
18 move Fairbanks to Anchorage or move Anchorage to
19 -- right on top of Susitna, just bring them all
20 together. Or we could wait until urban sprawl
21 happens and they connect. But probably not going
22 to happen in our lifetime. So I think it's time
23 for us to kind of just enjoy the location that
24 Mother Nature and God gave us and use it. And
25 electrically we'll use transmission lines to

1 deliver the power north and south.

2 Talk about the need. In Alaska, this
3 may be new to you guys, but we consider
4 hydropower to be renewable. I know that's not
5 the current logic in the Lower 48. I don't get
6 it. But I grew up in southeast Alaska and every
7 day we could see that it was renewable. Saw the
8 liquid sunshine on a daily basis down there. And
9 I think this is a good example of something that
10 we could use. Now southeast Alaska today has the
11 lowest energy cost of any place in the state.
12 They've been using hydropower for over a hundred
13 years in some locations. And those two concepts
14 go together. So once you get hydropower
15 installed you're going to lock into a rate and
16 it's not going to change very much for the next
17 -- for the life of the plant which is in the 100
18 year-plus range.

19 In 2008 Governor Palin set a
20 renewable portfolio standard for Alaska at 50
21 percent renewable. And she included hydro in
22 that because if you didn't use -- if you did not
23 include hydro in that statement we could not get
24 there. It's not possible to get 50 percent wind,
25 tidal, anything else doesn't work. So that's --

1 that was our -- that's our standard. Now today
2 Alaska is about 21 percent renewable at the
3 statewide basis. And interestingly enough if you
4 look at Anchorage they're about 95 percent on gas
5 and 5 percent on hydro. 5 percent from hydro is
6 from Cooper Lake, Bradley Lake, Eklutna and it's
7 only 5 percent. And I can tell you that Chugach
8 Electric's goal is go from the 5 percent
9 renewable to 95 percent renewable. And without a
10 large project like Susitna you'll never get
11 there.

12 So now let's look at the rest of the
13 state, outside the Railbelt. Most people don't
14 know this number, but right now outside the
15 Railbelt they're at 63 percent renewable
16 including hydro. And you go, well, how does that
17 make sense? Well, if you look at southeast
18 Alaska where all these large hydro plants exist,
19 they totally outweigh the rural areas in the
20 Alaska. So 63 percent is a pretty good number.
21 But you're not going to get there unless you
22 build a large hydro plant in Alaska. And this is
23 actually the only one available. So when AEA
24 looked at it they looked at two sites and I'll
25 mention those later.

1 Let's talk about opportunity real
2 quick. Alaska's the land of opportunity; right?
3 People have come here for years for an
4 opportunity to do something good with their
5 family and their life. And when that opportunity
6 ceases they leave. Alaska's a boom/bust --
7 Fairbanks is a boom/bust town. And you see it in
8 our economy, you see it in how we live our lives.
9 When the opportunities leave so do the people.
10 And so, you know, to get us a sustainable economy
11 you really need about four things, maybe more.
12 You need labor, you need energy, you need
13 infrastructure and financing. And I think
14 Susitna-Wantana Project provides all of those to
15 Alaska.

16 More significantly I want to talk
17 about -- I'm just going to give you kind of a
18 list of things or opportunities that this project
19 will give. It'll use state money to arrive from
20 nonrenewable resources or oil finance and develop
21 renewable resources for the long-term future.
22 It'll provide stable and affordable rates at
23 about 5 cents a kilowatt hour. If you go with
24 the standard 30-year financing you're talking
25 about 15 to 17 cents. Fairbanks would probably

1 love that right now but not for the next 100
2 years. And so with some state assistance, taking
3 some of this nonrenewable oil money, investing it
4 into a project like this you can get down to the
5 5 cent range for a 100 years.

6 So now you have to look at the
7 economy of Alaska and think of what that would
8 look like if you could offer anybody to say,
9 well, we know what our rates are going to be for
10 a hundred years. I don't know of anyplace else
11 in the state or in the world -- well, maybe not
12 the world but the United States -- that can make
13 a statement like that. Reduce the reliance on
14 fossil fuels by about the equivalent of about 25
15 billion cubic feet of gas a year. That's about
16 2.5 trillion cubic feet of gas over the 100 year
17 life of the project. That's a significant
18 number. That's the number they're all salivating
19 on in Cook Inlet right now that they think they
20 found 2.5 trillion cubic feet of gas. Lot of
21 gas. They'll act as hydro battery. So if you
22 want to have wind, great, but you need to have
23 something to regulate the frequency in that
24 system. Hydro does that perfectly. Tidal,
25 great, but you can't do it without the hydro.

1 Strengthening the transmission
2 systems to deliver this north and south. It'll
3 require more transmission lines to deliver that
4 power. And right now we have one single line
5 between Anchorage and Fairbanks rated about 70
6 megawatts. It's not -- it's 300 and something
7 miles long. Not the best redundant supply you'd
8 expect to have in a system in America anyhow.

9 It'll reduce CO2 emissions from the
10 combustion turbines -- right now I used natural
11 gas for this calculation -- by about 2.5 million
12 tons of CO2 a year. It'll also reduce SOx, NOx
13 and ROx, the nitrates of -- the nitrates -- I'm
14 going to call it SOx, NOx and ROx. You can
15 figure it out. SOx and NOx are the sulphur and
16 nitrates and then the ROx are the particulate
17 matter. So that's a function -- I didn't compute
18 that because it's really a function of what
19 resources you'd back off. If you used the high
20 sulphur fuels in Fairbanks, you know, it may give
21 a high number for sulphur. NOx may be more of a
22 gas-related issue.

23 And we'd reduce the capital cost in
24 replacing combustion turbines. Again, every 30
25 years you've got to go and put a new turbine in

1 instead of putting in one investment and it'll
2 last a hundred years. So you won't have to go
3 back to the state and say can you help me over
4 and over again for 30 years -- up to a hundred
5 years to replace the turbines every 30.

6 It'll reduce electric bills. We're
7 already talking about 5 cents. I would love to
8 see 5 cent power come in bulk into Fairbanks and
9 let Brian distribute it around the community.

10 It'll also develop a work force to
11 build this project. Again, what we need in
12 Alaska are jobs. We need a work force that can
13 go out there and build this and then move on to
14 the next project and stay in Alaska. What we
15 don't have in Alaska are careers. We have a lot
16 of jobs. We train them up for a job, then they
17 go someplace else. So we need to have a longer
18 term of view of Alaska.

19 It'll add value to Alaskan's
20 resources and create long term job opportunities
21 for Alaskans. So not just on the construction
22 but actually it'll help you for the next hundred
23 years in making jobs.

24 It'll let you use limestone out of
25 Livengood and Alaska natural gas to make cement

1 in Alaska instead of importing all our materials.

2 It'll also let you transition to a
3 much longer future. So if you want to go to a
4 hydrogen based technology you can use electricity
5 from this dam, deliver it to Fairbanks and
6 Anchorage, electrolyze it there and use hydrogen
7 as a fuel source, and you would have zero
8 emissions. Zero. Truly a zero emission
9 application for electricity, for heat and for
10 transportation.

11 I want to touch on another thing.
12 Alaska Energy Authority was told by the
13 legislature to do this project. And I know
14 they're conducting the Susitna study and review
15 and application in a highly professional manner.
16 And I was the executive director when Joe Thomas
17 submitted the bill and they passed it, that
18 basically said, AEA, go out there and start this
19 project. There's a lot of theories out there
20 that this is an AEA-driven thing, that they just
21 want to do it because they're bored. I can tell
22 you that's not the case. I can also tell you
23 that I personally know, I think, everybody in AEA
24 including the board and the -- and the Susitna
25 team except for maybe a few that came after I

1 left, about a year ago. And this group from top
2 to bottom, you know, they're honest, they're
3 open, they're thorough, they're fair, they're
4 balanced and ethical in their approach to this
5 project. I've met with a lot of them. I've
6 talked to them. They're not backing away from
7 any issue. They're just saying we're going to
8 grab it and we're going to find out the right
9 answer. And then they're going to pass that
10 information on to you.

11 So over the years I've learned that
12 anybody can slam on the breaks, it's easy. You
13 don't have to think about. You slam on the
14 brakes and you'll stop projects. If you look
15 around Alaska you'll find projects that have been
16 stopped over and over again in Alaska. Not much
17 thought, just "I don't like this part of it so
18 I'm going to slam on the breaks." Now if you
19 want -- it takes leadership, courage and vision
20 if you want to put your foot on the gas. But I
21 can tell you, you better have your hands on the
22 steering wheel and know where you're going before
23 you start slamming on the accelerator. So this
24 is not about just slamming on the brakes and
25 saying I don't like this little piece so let's

1 stop the whole thing. I think Alaska needs to
2 move beyond that. And FERC needs to look at this
3 project as if it's going to go. And now we need
4 to find the best course forward to make this
5 successful.

6 So in conclusion, I think the
7 Susitna-Watana project provides significant value
8 to all Alaskans and a source of hope both for
9 today's and future generations.

10 Thank you.

11 CLARK MILNE: Hi. Good evening. Thank
12 you for coming. It is wonderful to have you up
13 here hearing from us. You're going to hear from
14 a number of people apparently. My name is Clark
15 Milne. I'm representing myself. I work for the
16 Alaska DOT but I'm not representing them tonight.
17 My address here in town is 1119 Coppet Street,
18 Fairbanks 99709.

19 I don't have the record with Mike
20 here in the '60s or whatever, but I have an
21 interesting point of view and just a couple
22 points to make. Hope to do some written stuff
23 instead of boring the audience. But it's
24 interesting that I go back and worked on this
25 project in 1975 and '76 and '77 because I worked

1 on that -- the design and the study, the
2 \$2 million, I think, study that was done back
3 then which ended up in creating -- recommending
4 and then creating the AEA, the Alaska Energy
5 Authority. I worked for Lloyd Pernela as a
6 computer programmer while I was going to school
7 and working on my engineering master's. And
8 worked and did the commuter deck, et cetera, and
9 then turned that into a thesis. So my thesis
10 published in 1977 was economic power supply on
11 the Tanana Valley, 1975 to 2000. It wasn't
12 focused on Susitna but you can imagine Susitna
13 was known about. Rampart was already dead
14 halfway. And I was trying to remember -- I
15 hope -- I think Jack said or somebody said they'd
16 done Rampart. I hope they haven't changed their
17 mind on that part. We don't need Rampart but
18 Susitna-Watana was recommended in the -- that
19 study back then that pre-dated AEA saying that if
20 we're going to deliver power to Alaska that will
21 be cost effective and reliable, meet its needs,
22 be environmentally responsible and everything
23 else, then what should we do. And one of the
24 upper-end a little challenging deals was to have
25 Susitna because we had nowhere near the energy

1 use that we did then but was visible with load
2 growth and everything else. It was not obvious,
3 it was calculable that it would be a benefit.
4 And that is why we got started. That's why we,
5 the State, got started and AEA was authorized
6 then.

7 So I'm not an electrical expert. I
8 graduated an industrial engineer and a civil
9 engineer and an environmental engineer and that
10 makes me think, sitting on your side of the
11 table, it is interesting. I've done a number --
12 worked on a number of EISS and environmental
13 assessments, so I understand you're going to deal
14 with all these topics, and I'm not going to get
15 into many of these tonight -- any of these really
16 tonight, the issues, which is what you really
17 need. You need to hear have we missed anything
18 and what should we pour our attention into. I
19 fully understand that. But having observed since
20 1977, essentially 35 years, and I was kind of
21 bummed when it turned out in the mid-'80s that it
22 was dropped and it was because, indeed, of the
23 price of fuel. And too bad we didn't have enough
24 visionaries that we wouldn't have stopped it. I
25 think it is very human, but unfortunately we did

1 that. Let me mention on that point too -- but it
2 has been mentioned and we'd already been told in
3 some preparatory stuff for the hearing -- that
4 happily those studies and the effort that was
5 made for, I think, over a decade back then is
6 retrievable. And a lot of that data, the
7 underlying data instead of opinion or whatever
8 can be used. Some of that then can save us some
9 years on the preparation and do the project right
10 and yet be able to accelerate it.

11 The three points essentially I was
12 going to make because I think categorically it's
13 a good project from my point of view. For just a
14 few -- in my view the important ones are just a
15 few points. The cost efficiency per megawatt
16 which is really what Steve -- no one needs to
17 come and stand behind or come after Steve really
18 because he's really the expert having lead AEA
19 and some of the vision on the more recent energy
20 efforts in the modern times for Alaska, but if
21 we're going to -- if we look between the choices
22 of whether it's natural gas or coal or wind or
23 tidal or hydro, a good, legitimate, relatively
24 environmentally benign project like this is an
25 excellent way to go for the relative

1 investment -- a substantial investment but Alaska
2 can afford it -- yields enough megawatts to make
3 a difference. It'll be pointed out by some
4 detractors too that it doesn't take care of half
5 of Alaska's needs -- that's not exactly what is
6 meant -- but it will make a substantial
7 difference. And in terms of the low balancing
8 it'll be a real help.

9 I'll touch again on another point on
10 environmentally -- in particular, as was
11 mentioned by Mayor Hopkins, the air cleanliness.
12 The air quality benefits are substantial
13 everywhere that that power arrives. I think
14 you're quite aware of that. But we are getting
15 desperate facing and moving through the process
16 of our PM 2.5 non-attainment. We're very
17 worried. We're getting around the corner to the
18 time where EPA needs to start pounding on us.
19 We're already trying to go through them. We
20 don't have a lot of unanimity in Fairbanks on
21 exactly how we need to go through that process.
22 Even if we have to, I'll say wait, even though
23 it'll take 15 years to do it right and get to the
24 project, it would be like cheerfully crossing the
25 finish line. And to a degree we can hold that

1 out to EPA if we're in the midst of the process
2 and we know we are going to have a dam even
3 though it takes a while to create it.

4 Essentially, lastly, the stable
5 electrical power; having it, whether or not.
6 Because there'll be some people that say, wait a
7 minute, we don't really want you to have a lot of
8 spare and extra electricity so that you can do
9 nasty things, like, have a concrete plant, which
10 I think would be excellent by using limestone and
11 doing things. If we can have a large -- which
12 it's large but not huge and I don't think we're
13 going have a lot. I think we'll use all the
14 energy and it may be -- I do believe, as was
15 mentioned, I think, by Mayor Hopkins, if we can
16 design into the initial dam the possibility of
17 building Devil's Lake as well. I think that'd be
18 useful. It may not be and sometimes you have to
19 make the decision early on. So it may not be
20 that that's possible. But there really weren't
21 from 35 years ago any better alternatives that
22 looked like it had all the positive attributes
23 that the Susitna-Wantana dam does.

24 It's a pity that we did drop it there
25 in the mid-'80s but I think even now with modern

1 and therefore different conditions and rules --
2 environmental rules and lots of other things --
3 we will come to the same conclusion that it's a
4 good idea to build Susitna-Watana.

5 Thank you. Have a good evening.

6 KARL HANNEMAN: Good evening. My name's
7 Karl Hanneman and I'm here tonight on behalf of
8 Tower Hill Mines. And on behalf of Tower Hill
9 I'm going to thank you for making the effort to
10 come to Fairbanks for this scoping meeting.

11 The high cost of energy is a
12 significant concern to all Alaskans and
13 particular to those on the power grid in Interior
14 Alaska from Healy to Delta Junction. While
15 Interior Alaska may not consume as much total
16 energy as our neighbors south of the Alaska
17 Range, our cold and dark winters make the cost of
18 energy a daily concern for all in the interior.
19 Interior Alaska has a significant stake in the
20 success of the Susitna-Wantana hydro project and
21 I thank you for recognizing that stake by
22 agreeing to hold this public meeting in Fairbanks
23 and allowing us the opportunity to voice support
24 for the project.

25 Tower Hill Mines is a junior mining

1 company conducting a feasibility study on the
2 potential development of the Livengood Gold
3 Project located by paved highway 70 miles north
4 of Fairbanks. With a gold resource of over
5 20 million ounces, the Livengood Gold Project is
6 ranked in the top tier of the under developed
7 gold projects in the world. The Livengood Mine
8 is envisioned as a large surface mine with a
9 capital investment of approximately \$1.6 million,
10 a mine life of 23 years, over a thousand jobs
11 during construction and approximately 500
12 long-term jobs for a generation of Alaskans. As
13 we evaluate the feasibility of this project and
14 contemplate the construction of a 50 mile
15 transmission line so that we can join the ranks
16 of the other mines in the region who currently
17 purchase power off the grid such as Fort Knox,
18 Pogo and Usibelli.

19 We are aware of the critical
20 sensitivity of our project to the high cost of
21 energy. Susitna-Wantana hydro has great
22 potential to help stabilize long term energy
23 costs in Alaska and could make a meaningful
24 difference in the viability of long term projects
25 such as the Livengood Gold Project. Thus we

1 offer the following comments on your review and
2 licensing process:

3 First, we encourage FERC to complete
4 all licensing and environmental reviews in a
5 timely manner. Alaska has an energy policy of
6 producing 50 percent of its generation from
7 renewable and alternative energy sources by 2025.
8 Susitna should be the anchor project on the
9 Railbelt to help achieve this goal. Alaska will
10 benefit greatly by getting started as soon as
11 possible.

12 Second, we encourage FERC to support
13 a project configuration from Susitna-Watana that
14 maximizes the unique characteristics of this site
15 and maximizes the long-term benefit to Alaskans.
16 We know from previous work that the hydropower
17 potential available in the region is much larger
18 than is being contemplated in the current
19 proposal. We must not be satisfied with
20 producing a fraction of current power needs, but
21 instead must look to the future and the
22 opportunities for Alaska that low cost energy
23 would provide. We should consider the Norway
24 example of exporting our oil and gas for cash
25 while building long-term hydroelectric base load

1 capacity here to support affordable lifestyles at
2 home.

3 So please remain open to considering
4 alternatives that could increase the scope and
5 benefits of this project to Alaska. With these
6 comments in mind, Tower Hill Mines supports
7 completion of the Susitna-Watana Hydro Project.

8 Thank you again for your time and
9 effort in holding this meeting.

10 LISA HERBERT: My name is Lisa Herbert.
11 I'm the executive director of the Greater
12 Fairbanks Chamber of Commerce and I want to thank
13 you for holding this public meeting here in
14 Fairbanks.

15 The Fairbanks Chamber is a business
16 advocacy organization that represents over 700
17 businesses and organizations throughout the
18 interior. We strive to ensure that Fairbanks is
19 a great place for both business and community.
20 The board of directors of the Chamber has
21 identified high cost of energy as the Fairbanks
22 Chamber's number one priority this year, as it
23 did this last year as well.

24 While it is a warm sunny 45 degrees
25 today that was not the case just two months ago.

1 In fact it was quite the opposite. January 2012
2 was one of the coldest months on record
3 experienced by the business and resident
4 communities of Fairbanks.

5 Temperatures of minus 40 degrees
6 below zero became the norm here. While cold
7 winters aren't new to us, rising energy costs
8 that are crippling our economies are. To put
9 things into perspective, my husband and I own a
10 1,400 square foot home. My electric bill for the
11 month of January was nearly \$300. And combined
12 with my fuel bill nearly equaled my 1,400 monthly
13 mortgage payment.

14 In the interior this scenario's not
15 unique. The moneys being spent on enormous
16 electric and heating bills limits the disposable
17 income that could otherwise be spent on the local
18 economy. The Chamber supports the Susitna-Watana
19 Hydroelectric Project as a long term alternative
20 energy source. The project will diversify the
21 railbelt's energy portfolio taking us one step
22 closer to meeting the state of Alaska's 50
23 percent renewable energy goal by 2025. This
24 project can be safely built in our seismically
25 actively state, similar to that of other major

1 infrastructure and dam projects that are built in
2 earthquake zones around the world. The project
3 will also lead to economic benefits that include
4 new businesses and jobs, something very important
5 to the Fairbanks Chamber of Commerce.

6 I urge FERC to allow this project to
7 move forward as planned with timely studies and
8 to work collaboratively with all stakeholders.
9 The Chamber fully supports responsible resource
10 development in Alaska and I'm confident this
11 project can move forward with minimal impacts to
12 the Susitna River salmon run. Once built the
13 hydropower's carbon footprint will also drop
14 virtually to nothing. The Chamber looks forward
15 to continue opportunities to support and provide
16 public comment.

17 And I thank you again for allowing
18 testimony here in Fairbanks.

19 DON ROSS: Good evening. Thank you for
20 this opportunity to speak. My name is Don Ross.
21 And I'd like to think that I'm speaking for the
22 voiceless many who are underrepresented here.

23 In my view the Susitna dam is putting
24 the cart before the horse. The state of Alaska
25 has not done its homework. No comprehensive

1 energy plans exists to determine the most cost
2 effective and least environmentally destructive
3 mix of renewable and nonrenewable energy projects
4 that will best serve the citizens of this state.

5 Entirely missing is any analysis of
6 how increased efficiency and conservation might
7 play out and benefit everyone were a
8 comprehensive approach taken, instead of a
9 hodgepodge of projects pushed by various interest
10 groups with only a superficial analysis at best.
11 According to data from Jan Konigsberg with
12 hydroreform.org, state produced gas from Cook
13 Inlet could be produced at half the total
14 investment in the Susitna dam, yielding four
15 times the energy at one-third the price. This
16 alternative ought to be part of your assessment.
17 It should be a part of a so far nonexistent
18 comprehensive state energy plan.

19 One of the rationales for the Susitna
20 dam is that Cook Inlet gas is running out. But
21 it didn't. New discoveries have been made but
22 state regulations do not compel its production in
23 conjunction with oil exploration, and they
24 should.

25 It is telling that Railbelt utilities

1 would not invest in the Susitna dam on their own.
2 To be feasible it will require an outright state
3 of Alaska grant of at least half the project
4 cost. And with these dam projects there is no
5 certainty that final costs will be anywhere close
6 to projected cost. And Susitna dam would not
7 give Fairbanks more cost effective home heating.

8 The history of large hydro projects
9 in the Lower 48 is not a pretty one. Salmon runs
10 on the Columbia River have been decimated. And
11 how would the irregular flow regime and icing
12 from the Susitna dam affect downstream
13 overwintering salmon fry? And the reduced
14 sediment load in the river would change its
15 essential downstream character indefinitely and
16 also with potential impacts on estuarian
17 habitats. A list of probable and potential
18 harmful -- harm from loss and flooded -- flooded
19 overwintering moose habitat, impacts on fish and
20 migrating caribou, when there are less-damaging
21 alternatives, make this in my view, a sow's ear
22 and not a silk purse.

23 A no-action alternative is the wisest
24 choice considering the still virtually pristine
25 character of the area where the dam would be

1 built, and ensuing permanent alteration and harm
2 to the environment, given that there is a
3 potentially more cost effective and less harmful
4 gas alternative. And I think that at least
5 should be considered.

6 Thank you.

7 CHARLES JONES: My name is Charles Jones
8 and I'm a Ph.D student here at the university.
9 I've did my master's work studying the
10 environmental impacts the dams have on the
11 rivers. And I've also worked as a consultant
12 writing river restoration plans to mitigate the
13 effects of dams on rivers in the Lower 48. So I
14 have some experience with dams and the impact
15 that they have. But I'm also very, very
16 supportive of clean energy and the clean air for
17 ourselves and future generations. But I do think
18 it's important that when we work with dams and
19 design them and develop the flows, that we do so
20 to minimize the impacts while providing
21 affordable and clean energy.

22 I wish that we could focus on energy
23 conservation prior to the construction of these
24 kinds of projects. But I know that that's not
25 your role to play in this process. I also think

1 it's important while there's a lot of people
2 pushing for it to go forward as fast as we can.
3 I think it's really important not to rush the
4 environmental impact studies. You know, in 30 to
5 50 years they're going to need to relicense this
6 dam and figure out what the impacts were. And I
7 think it's really important to have a good,
8 quality set of baseline studies performed prior
9 to the construction of any dam project so they
10 can be used to determine what the effects of the
11 dam have been in the future.

12 I think it's important -- I think
13 it's really great that they have the existing
14 studies from the 1980s. But I do think they
15 should be complimented with new studies that can
16 help determine what effects there have been or
17 what changes there have been since 1980. It
18 provides us a really good quality data set to
19 have to actually assess what the current
20 condition is. I think that there's been some
21 other projects, like the Colorado River projects
22 that were designed around flows that didn't
23 actually exist in the long term. They were a
24 short term -- short term hydrologic phenomenon at
25 that point.

1 So one I think -- I see a few things
2 missing in your list of studies that I think are
3 important to consider, particularly climate. In
4 northern latitudes we are experiencing climate
5 change to a greater degree than a lot of other
6 parts of the world. And I think it's really
7 important to consider the climatological effects
8 of hydrology including precipitation and future
9 flows of the watershed. I think it's important
10 to look at how climate change might affect the
11 geomorphic impacts and the affected fish habitat
12 upstream and downstream in the project area.

13 Again, I think it's important to do
14 the baseline studies. Once the dam is
15 constructed there won't be any chance to get that
16 -- to do those studies again or to get that data.

17 And another thing I think is really
18 important is that future flow of management
19 should be -- have an adaptive approach.
20 Shouldn't be prescribed but we should have some
21 sort of adaptive approach that we can actually
22 modify the management of the dam so that we can
23 minimize environmental impacts in the future.

24 A lot of people have been stating
25 that there's going to be low impacts by the dam.

1 But I think that's very premature to say that.
2 It's very reliant on how the dam is managed and
3 the construction of the dam, the design of the
4 dam. I think it's important to actually use
5 smart designs while they're constructing the dam
6 and designing the dam so that we have lower
7 impacts on the stream water temperatures and
8 river geomorphology in the future.

9 With that, again, I'm really
10 supportive of clean energy, really supportive of
11 these kinds of projects when they're done right.
12 And I think that's the most important thing is
13 that it's done right so that it's not affecting
14 the landscape and ecosystems for future
15 generations to deny them the opportunities that
16 we have today.

17 Thank you.

18 JON MILLER: Hi, I'm Jon Miller and I'm
19 representing myself. Thanks very much for coming
20 to Fairbanks.

21 As you've probably noticed by now
22 Alaskans are extremely impressed by and
23 enthusiastic about huge development campaigns. I
24 think it's fair to say that Fairbanks has never
25 met a capital project it doesn't like. If left

1 to public enthusiasm we'd have seen Project
2 Chariot blast a coast harbor in northwest Alaska
3 with an atomic blast. It would've been
4 catastrophic. The Rampart dam would've flooded
5 the highly productive Yukon flats at tremendous
6 environmental damage. Devil's Canyon wasn't cost
7 effective and that's what sunk it. But we were
8 definitely involved in environmental studies at
9 the time that left it in question whether or not
10 it was environmentally wise. And that's where we
11 are right now. We still haven't answered those
12 questions.

13 And I'd just like to remind you that
14 good, innovative, bold ideas still need to be
15 fully analyzed, debated and questioned. And
16 that, I understand, is your role. And I would
17 like to encourage you to consider the widest
18 range of alternatives possible. That includes
19 energy efficiency, includes natural gas coming up
20 from the new discoveries in Cook Inlet.

21 At this early stage of research, I'm
22 afraid that that's not what you're hearing from
23 Fairbanks right now. They're urging -- many
24 people are urging you to pursue this,
25 irrespective of what the research shows. And I

1 think that that's premature and a
2 counterproductive attitude to approach these
3 studies with.

4 In particular I'd like to put in a
5 plug for energy efficiency. Two recent studies:
6 The real report in Alaska that examined energy
7 efficiency across the Railbelt and the Fairbanks
8 first fuel analysis, they both indicated that we
9 could save somewhere up to 50 percent of our
10 current electrical use. And that's been --
11 that's been hotly contested by local experts.
12 I'm certainly not in a position to comment on
13 that except to say that savings anywhere near
14 that amount really need to make us look at
15 whether or not this is time for a huge project,
16 especially with a \$4.5 billion price tag.

17 And, again, earlier Don Ross
18 mentioned Jan Konigsberg's recent analysis of gas
19 fields in Cook Inlet. And it looks like they're
20 political reasons that we're not taking advantage
21 of those rather than resource reasons. And if
22 those resources were developed by the state of
23 Alaska -- they're state owned, that means that we
24 all own them -- we could have not only
25 electrical -- cheaper electrical generation than

1 Susitna would provide but also space heating
2 which dwarfs our electrical needs. And so I'd
3 urge you, to the extent possible, to consider our
4 whole energy portfolio and not simply electrical
5 generation.

6 And I'll submit written comments also
7 more specific, but just in summary I would
8 encourage you to uphold your regulatory authority
9 and your obligation to provide Alaskans with a
10 rigorous review of the economic, social and
11 environmental risks and benefits posed by this
12 project.

13 Thanks very much.

14 WILLIAM HARRISON: My name is William
15 Harrison. I'm a retired professor from the
16 University of Alaska's geophysical institute,
17 snow, ice and permafrost group. I speak for
18 myself. I was involved in the glacier studies in
19 the original project that ended in 1986. I
20 headed that project and several other people were
21 involved.

22 Before you forget the previous talk,
23 I want to mention one other big project that we
24 all loved up here that would've been a disaster
25 if it had not been stopped by regulatory or

1 slowed down by regulatory considerations: It was
2 the pipeline. The designers never heard of
3 permafrost. And if they had built the pipeline
4 the way they wanted, it would've been a disaster
5 not only for the state but for themselves.

6 I don't feel quite that way about
7 Susitna but I want to be specific about the
8 things I know best. When our little project was
9 kind of a five generations or five rungs down the
10 food chain from other funders who passed on the
11 money, who passed on the money, who passed on the
12 money, so it was kind of a managerial challenge
13 to put all this together. And I'm not sure if we
14 succeeded in getting the glacier word across or
15 not. I think to some extent we have. And
16 there's more glacier studies going on at the
17 moment run by the competent people.

18 I like to think we've come a long way
19 from the initial days of the project in which the
20 hydrologists cut off the basin at the tongues of
21 the glaciers because they didn't know what they
22 were. But in reality they're 30 percent or 40
23 percent of the water. And that is very critical
24 water because it's regulated water. Produces
25 lots of water in hot, dry weather. There's major

1 storage, the whole hydrology is different. So
2 I'm reasonably happy that that's going okay.

3 Regulation and water supply, there's
4 one other issue. All of the glaciers (sic) in
5 Alaska are regulated by glaciers except the
6 curiously -- one glacier in the Brooks Range up
7 in the north. And so the regime that we see out
8 here in the Tanana River would be completely
9 different if it weren't for the glaciers in the
10 Alaska Range. So it's a big deal. And I
11 think -- I'd like to think that we're on top of
12 it.

13 There's another issue though, it's
14 the question of sediment. Glaciers are prolific
15 producers of sediment. And in our preliminary
16 studies prior to 1986 we noticed that the period
17 of gauging of the river sediment, the Susitna
18 River sediment at Gold King did not -- Gold Creek
19 did not include a time in which one of the major
20 glaciers in the basin surged. Surging glaciers
21 tend to be periodic and occur every few decades,
22 only from certain glaciers, and they produce
23 fantastic amounts of sediment. The sediment
24 produced during the surge of a irrigated
25 glacier in -- near Yakutat, was studied some

1 years ago, was something, it was something like
2 100 grams per liter. It looked more like cement
3 than sediment. But the project ended before a
4 glacier surge. So that whole stretch of sediment
5 gauging didn't have that information in it, what
6 effect that might have.

7 And 1988 the glacier -- the West Fork
8 Glacier, one of the two biggest glaciers in the
9 basin up there, did surge. And I found the other
10 day some data, was actually how much data was
11 produced by the surge and how much was -- and
12 this actually showed up at Gold Creek. And I
13 believe that there should be a study using that
14 data trying to rethink the sediment regime of the
15 river both in terms of sedimentation of the
16 reservoir and its effect on turbidity on the fish
17 and so forth. It includes the data from that
18 surge.

19 It's very easy to get caught up in
20 the engineering details, and I'm certainly guilty
21 of that. And as I got more -- worked up there,
22 got more familiar with the basis I saw -- I began
23 to ask myself questions. Is this a good idea? I
24 mean, it's hard to think outside the box when
25 you're that close to it. And after years of

1 thinking about it, I've decided it's not a good
2 idea. The whole project is not a good idea. And
3 it's been argued in favor of, on the basis --
4 quite eloquently on the basis of socioeconomic
5 conditions but I still don't like it. There's no
6 end to it. I mean, so we build this one and then
7 we build another one. This is a pristine basin.
8 Do we -- what's the -- how do we balance having a
9 pristine basin and having an industrial
10 development? And pristine basins are a vanishing
11 species over the world. And I think if you take
12 a really long term view that this is not a good
13 idea; it might have been a 100 years ago.

14 And I'm also skeptical that the
15 state's study of alternatives has been entirely
16 unbiased. I get the impression that they're
17 going to -- they've made up their minds, they
18 have the Susitna Project, come what may and
19 everything else is window dressing. I hate to be
20 so skeptical but that's the way I really feel.
21 And I don't think those of us who are arrogant as
22 private individuals will carry much weight here
23 in the state as you've heard tonight. But I
24 think perhaps -- I hope that's your job to think
25 on a broader term than most people have here

1 tonight.

2 Thank you for coming.

3 DAVID PRUHS: My name is David Pruhs, and
4 I'm a real estate broker here in town and I speak
5 on behalf of myself. First of all, thank you for
6 coming to Fairbanks and presenting to us this
7 project. You're going to get a wide diverse of
8 opinion up here. I'm glad you're listening to
9 it.

10 There's a couple of people who spoke.
11 One of them is Bob Huffman. I was fortunate
12 enough to grow up down the street from Mr. Huffman
13 who worked for GVA for 30 to 45 years. Another
14 person who's a good friend of mine is Irvin Ray
15 who is not here tonight.

16 They were working on this in the
17 '70s. In the '70s I was up at Pump Station 1
18 when they turned on the pipeline. And they
19 started letting us go in 1977 and everyone said,
20 don't worry, we'll all be back in six months to
21 build the gas line. That was in 1977.

22 There's been two large energy
23 projects for the interior, if not Alaska. The
24 Susitna, the gas line. I don't want to be here
25 in 35 years like Bob Huffman or Irvin Ray and

1 saying why didn't we do this 35 years ago. I
2 think you should listen to what Mayor Hopkins
3 said. Expedite this project. This has been
4 studied for 30 years. This has to go through so
5 many regulatory permit aspects it will be done
6 right. Fairbanks needs this. The state of
7 Alaska needs this. And I thank you for coming up
8 here and having this discussion.

9 KIM NGUYEN: Anyone else?

10 ANNIKA JUNE: My name's Annika June. I
11 don't really have prepared comments but I do want
12 to speak to conservation. The idea that we would
13 destroy a pristine watershed when we could save
14 half of the energy gained by conservation just --
15 I mean, there's an awful lot of deplorable things
16 going on in the world but that would strike me as
17 one of them.

18 And then of course if we could simply
19 capture the methane that is being burned off in
20 flares on the North Slope, that would be an
21 enormous contribution to energy.

22 So I would encourage the pipeline
23 before damming the Susitna which really is one of
24 the last great wild rivers in America and in the
25 world. And we should keep it that way.

1 Thanks.

2 CAROL GOLKEY: Good evening. My name's
3 Carol Golkey. I'm here on behalf of myself.

4 I just want to say that hindsight is
5 20/20. If we had built this thing when it was
6 supposed to be built we wouldn't be here today.
7 If we would have built the gas line, as Dave
8 talked about, you know, we wouldn't be paying the
9 high energy costs as we are today.

10 The cost of living here in Fairbanks
11 compared to Juneau, compared to Anchorage is a
12 heck of a lot higher. The one good thing that we
13 have is Golden Valley. However, on Golden
14 Valley -- and on that I mean is they're
15 diversified. They have oil, they have coal.
16 They're working on wind. And they'll have -- and
17 they have hydro coming up and they have
18 capability as gas.

19 The bad thing about Golden Valley is,
20 is that we're paying more in fuel surcharge than
21 we are for the electricity. Had this dam been
22 built we wouldn't be paying that.

23 On the news in the Lower 48 I hear
24 that gas is less than half of what it was a year
25 ago. And more and more people are talking about

1 initiating new manufacturers with gas. And then
2 they talk about eliminating any coal-producing
3 power plants. And, you know, I have to disagree.
4 Again, diversification is what we need. If you
5 look at Cook Inlet or down in Anchorage, they're
6 on gas. What happens if that gas ever goes away?
7 And we -- we've -- we saw that a few years ago or
8 a couple of years ago on the blackouts in
9 Anchorage.

10 I think we need this not only for
11 Fairbanks but for the state just to be
12 diversified because it may save us. God forbid
13 if we ever get the '67 flood or the tsunami that
14 comes in again. What's going to happen to the
15 coastline? At least up here in Fairbanks we have
16 that diversification and the Susitna dam would
17 help us tremendously.

18 Again, you know, hindsight is 20/20.
19 And I think we can't afford to have hindsight, as
20 Dave says, in 30 years from now. We need to get
21 this thing built.

22 Thank you.

23 ROGER BURGGRAF: I'm Roger Burggraf. I
24 reside at 830 Sheep Creek Road, Fairbanks,
25 Alaska. I've been a resident of the Fairbanks

1 area since 1959. I've worked with numerous
2 groups that have studied our energy needs in this
3 state. And we are in a crisis situation in the
4 Fairbanks area right now.

5 Early in the '80s the extensive
6 studies were done on the Susitna dam.
7 Construction and low oil prices and opposition to
8 the project killed it. Had we built the dam in
9 the '80s we would not be in the fix that we're in
10 now with huge electrical costs that are driving
11 out local residents. And a lot of people can't
12 afford to pay the high electrical costs plus the
13 high fuel bills.

14 The Susitna-Watana dam is situated in
15 an ideal location. We have studied numerous
16 other locations in the state, and by far it is
17 the best location which would create the least
18 environmental damage that I've seen.

19 The project would produce a
20 renewable, sustainable, low-cost energy for over
21 100 years. Southeast Alaska has had
22 hydroelectric power for over a hundred years and
23 they've benefited from low-cost energy. And the
24 recent avalanches that shut off the hydroelectric
25 power in the Juneau area created havoc and they

1 realized what -- how difficult it is to produce
2 electricity with oil.

3 The present dam height that's
4 estimated is projected to be about 700 feet high
5 and to be constructed in a way that the height of
6 the dam can be raised at a later date to provide
7 additional energy if it's needed.

8 Hydroelectric power, next to coal, is
9 the cheapest source of energy. And it's a long
10 term source of power. Once the capital costs are
11 paid for rates can go down. And God knows, you
12 know, we need lower energy costs.

13 The projected dam will produce about
14 600 megawatts. Fairbanks will get approximately
15 250 megawatts. And by the time it's completed it
16 will replace some of the existing power plants
17 which will probably become obsolete. So nothing
18 is being done to project our energy -- production
19 of energy for the long term. In a way it's sort
20 of a short-sided project, although it is designed
21 in such a way that the dam could be raised.

22 And some comments were made regarding
23 silting. Numerous studies have been done and
24 silting will not be a major problem. So that's
25 something that needs to be taken into

1 consideration. You raise the level of the dam
2 you're going to lengthen the life of the project.

3 The Tolovana limestone deposit is one
4 of the highest grade limestone deposits in the
5 state, maybe the nation. And it can be used
6 to -- if it's put into production, to produce
7 cement and limestone and other products which are
8 needed for industry.

9 The other thing about this is that
10 it's going to create jobs. And God knows we need
11 jobs in this state for people to live and stay up
12 here. The nay-sayers that sit back say, well,
13 all we have to do is conserve electricity and we
14 don't need any more electricity. I think it's
15 not looking forward very well. This state has
16 tremendous resources and these resources are here
17 to be developed if they're done in an
18 environmentally sound manner.

19 So I heartily recommend that the
20 project move ahead. God knows it's needed. And
21 unfortunately I wish it would've been done about
22 30 years ago.

23 Thank you.

24 KIM NGUYEN: Mr. Burggraf, those studies
25 that you've mentioned, is there any way you can

1 send those in to us or is there any way we can
2 get a copy of those results?

3 ROGER BURGGRAF: Well, I've reviewed a lot
4 of the studies that were done in the early years
5 and was involved in them. And I'm sure you
6 probably have them. I've worked -- been on a
7 committee -- energy committee with the Fairbanks
8 FEDC. And, you know, it's something I've been
9 very much interested since I am pro-development
10 and I want to see Alaskans have jobs and have
11 jobs for our young people that are coming up.

12 Okay. Thank you.

13 KIM NGUYEN: I'm sorry, before you start.
14 I think the professor who spoke before, if you
15 can -- if you know the results of those studies
16 could you also send them in to us? Thank you.

17 LISSA HUGHES: Thank you for the
18 opportunity to testify this evening. My name is
19 Lissa Hughes and I'm representing the Northern
20 Alaska Environmental Center.

21 Our organization has promoted
22 conservation of the environment and sustainable
23 resource, stewardship in Interior and Arctic
24 Alaska through education and advocacy since 1971.
25 Our membership is comprised of Alaskans from many

1 walks of life including fishermen, hunters,
2 outdoor recreational enthusiasts, guides,
3 subsistence users and other individuals that
4 depend economically on tourism and recreation
5 opportunities.

6 We support the development of
7 appropriately scaled, environmentally sound
8 energy projects that serve the needs of our
9 communities, are cost effective in benefiting the
10 greatest number of Alaskans, and create the
11 fewest substantial lasting environmental impacts.
12 Thus, for a variety of reasons we have concerns
13 about this proposed dam.

14 Aquatic habitat will be impacted both
15 upstream and downstream from the dam from altered
16 hydrology, temperature variations, changing
17 riparian areas and the potential impacts of fish
18 including five species of salmon. We feel that
19 the compressed time line proposed by the Alaska
20 Energy Authority will not be adequate to
21 appropriately address these concerns.

22 The estimated 4.5 billion price tag
23 of the proposed dam is a huge cost by itself and
24 does not include the necessary transmission grid
25 upgrades. The Susitna-Watana dam only addressed

1 approximately 30 percent of our electric needs.
2 Railbelt customers will continue to rely on
3 natural gas, oil and coal for the remainder of
4 their electricity and all of their heating needs
5 even if this dam is constructed. Thus, the dam
6 appears to be an extremely expensive solution
7 that leaves very critical needs unmet.

8 We're also concerned that this dam,
9 should it be constructed, benefit the realized
10 values by existing ratepayers.

11 While we applaud the Alaska Energy
12 Authority for seeking long-term solutions and
13 alternatives to traditional fossil fuel based
14 energy, we do not think that this dam as
15 currently proposed is in the best interest of the
16 public.

17 Thank you for the opportunity to
18 speak tonight.

19 JOHN SCHAUER: My name's John Schauer and
20 I don't have much of a voice tonight. But I want
21 to thank you for coming and seeking this public
22 input. And I want to encourage you throughout
23 the entire permitting process integrating to
24 continue with that opportunity for public input.

25 I'm speaking on behalf of myself.

1 I've been here since 1979 and intend to keep
2 here. So some of the other folks that have been
3 here another 20 years, I hope I'm still here 20
4 years down the line.

5 I think its really commendable that
6 the state has that goal of having 50 percent or
7 more of renewable energy coming up. But I'm not
8 totally convinced that the "go big or go home"
9 approach is the only way to achieve that. I'm
10 curious --

11 First of all I haven't seen many
12 projects that are completed on the projected, you
13 know, 4.5 billion. Typically those costs overrun
14 around the order of 50 to 100 percent of those
15 projections in most projects I'm aware of. We're
16 talking about something that's an order of
17 magnitude larger than the Bradley Project. I
18 think it's about 125 feet. I think its cost in
19 '92 -- I think it was about 400 million or so in
20 those dollars. I may be off on the numbers. But
21 we're talking about a project about -- you know,
22 in order of magnitude over the size of the other
23 ones that are currently coming in.

24 I'm a member of GVA co-op for a long
25 time. I pay those costs for my electrical bills.

1 I try to find ways to conserve that and
2 supplement my bill. But with the first megawatt
3 coming out of this projected at -- being with the
4 ILP process -- at least 22 years from now,
5 there's a huge amount of investment that goes in
6 there. And I'm curious, you know, when you hear
7 numbers like 600 megawatt capacity and using
8 those figures, I believe the real numbers are
9 here and we're closer to 250 is what the winter
10 output -- 250 megawatts. And so -- and then the
11 subsidies for this coming.

12 I'm really curious and I'm really
13 hoping that you'll look at -- when we talk about
14 socioeconomic, what the real actual costs are in
15 the process. And in going through the scoping
16 document over the last couple days that you don't
17 short circuit the process. There's a tremendous
18 number of agencies involved in just the whole
19 process, the permitting process. And the
20 integrated licensing process has some pretty
21 strict time lines. And I know that some of the
22 comments by agencies that would have to be
23 involved in input for -- in that indicated that,
24 you know, even though AEA hasn't requested that
25 alternative licensing process that some of the

1 input you got was that, wow, to meet these kind
2 of time lines for the depth of the studies, some
3 of the -- I think it's great that you've
4 identified a tremendous number of the types of
5 studies that have to be.

6 I'm very interested in recreational
7 resources and land use. That's why I chose to
8 make Alaska my home and have -- and continue to
9 remain here. Both my sons have been raised here
10 and one of them actually is a hydrologist now.
11 Graduated from our school system and through
12 University of Alaska. Is working for a federal
13 agency as a hydrologist. And so I'm very
14 interested in what happens when our summer flows
15 reduce by 60 percent at Gold Creek as stated
16 earlier. Typical 20 -- I think we hear 23,000
17 CFS at Gold Creek now and after the project is
18 online, reducing that to 9,000. What happens
19 when flooding doesn't happen on a regular basis?
20 Certainly there's other cases of dam controlled
21 rivers in the Lower 48 that have had huge impact
22 when the annual changes don't come. When some of
23 the sloughs that are salmon rearing habitat
24 aren't filled in the spring time and reduced.

25 I'm curious what happens with -- I

1 certainly, just in 20 years of spending a
2 lifetime in the Alaska Range, seeing changes in
3 the glacial regime of the Alaska Range. I've
4 spent a lot of time in the eastern Alaska Range
5 and some of the central. And you know, when
6 we're talking about a hundred year project, you
7 know, I've seen changes, you know, in the short,
8 short time I've been here in the amount of flow.
9 Sometimes if you look at short term hydrology it
10 looks like it's pretty steady flows. But what
11 happens when those big glacial systems that are
12 providing a lot of the flow for that change in 50
13 to 100 years. I'm curious what our actual costs
14 are. So I'm encouraging you to please look at
15 that.

16 Some of the things I think are going
17 to be really hard to get information on in the
18 process -- you've listed aesthetics and
19 recreational uses. The downstream section of the
20 downstream of Watana which is a well known canyon
21 right now, since the mid-'70s it's -- the Susitna
22 River's been considered one of the top -- the top
23 whitewater destinations in North America. It's
24 one of the big three grand slam runs. Although
25 this project is upstream of that it might

1 actually make the ability to run that -- I think
2 the importance of guaranteeing access to that
3 river resource, not only after the project's
4 completed but during, any kind of study in
5 construction projects is incredibly important. I
6 know a number of people that have actually, you
7 know, had the opportunity to float Devil's Canyon
8 and Susitna. And Watana would certainly eliminate
9 the potential of putting on Denali Highway and
10 floating down to take out. And so it's certainly
11 something that I don't think BLM or the other
12 managing agencies in that area have any kind of
13 good data on. It's not a well regulated area.

14 So I encourage you to be very
15 thorough, not to short circuit the permitting
16 process and the EIS review process, and that you
17 continue to give the opportunity for folks to
18 give public input through the process.

19 Thank you.

20 ANNE HARRISON: Hello and thank you for
21 coming and listening to us. My name is Anne
22 Harrison. I speak for myself. And I'll speak
23 very shortly too.

24 But I want to say that as we talk
25 about the socioeconomic needs of a community

1 which I'm very in-tune with, I also realize it's
2 a vicious circle. They will always be with us.
3 No matter how much you have, there's more people
4 using. If you create more jobs there'll be more
5 people coming to our communities and we'll need
6 more resources all the time to house those people
7 and to provide power and all to them. So I think
8 we really do have to look at what we're doing.
9 Do we want more people running into what many of
10 us came to Alaska for? That was a special
11 lifestyle.

12 And, anyway, the former speaker spoke
13 of Juneau and the havoc that was caused after a
14 major power outage. What he didn't mention was
15 what the community did, and that was reduce their
16 power consumption by -- I'm not good with
17 numbers, I don't remember -- but a very, very
18 significant amount. So in terms of conservation
19 we can do it. It's not the answer totally but we
20 can get there if we really as a group work hard
21 enough.

22 So I guess I'm one of those
23 nay-sayers that someone called us, but I think
24 there's great hope for us in just conserving our
25 resources and not always -- and I'm not sure I'm

1 even against Susitna. But I -- I really want to
2 look very, very carefully at all aspects of it.

3 Thank you very much.

4 DANIEL SWIFT: My name is Daniel Swift.
5 I'm speaking for myself.

6 And the one issue that hasn't really
7 been raised here is that of global warming. And
8 this is the only project I know of that is viable
9 in Alaska that will reduce the amount of CO2 that
10 we're putting into the atmosphere. And this is
11 the main reason that I'm supporting it.

12 The other alternative I think that's
13 been mentioned of course is natural gas. Burning
14 of natural gas of course is a CO2 producer, but
15 only about half as much as coal. But, again, the
16 emissions from the Susitna project would be zero.

17 Thank you.

18 KIM NGUYEN: Is there anyone else?

19 I would like to add that for all of
20 those who spoke today, if you have the data from
21 studies that you mentioned and the results from
22 those studies or any kind of data you have,
23 please send them into us. We would love to have
24 that as part of the project record.

25 Here are some important dates that

1 are coming up. And like I've said before, since
2 we do have that extension of time request for
3 filing of studies and comments, they're going to
4 probably be due on May 31st instead of the 4/27
5 date. And then with those study requests AEA
6 will compile a proposed study plan and file it
7 with FERC. That's going to probably be June --
8 July sometime. And then after those we're going
9 to have many meetings, study plan meetings. And
10 those are all open for you, the public, to attend
11 too, to talk about those study plans. And then
12 from those study plan meetings they will call a
13 revised study plan probably in November now. And
14 then the Commission will make a determination on
15 those study plans and will set forth a study
16 planning determination document by December.

17 Okay. Are there any additional
18 comments or questions that we can answer for you?

19 Hearing none.

20 The transcript for this meeting will
21 be available on our -- online probably no sooner
22 than ten days from today.

23 You can access our eLibrary system at
24 FERC.gov to see this transcript.

25 And I thank you for your

1 participation today. And if there are no other
2 questions the meeting is closed.

3 (Whereupon the scoping meeting was
4 concluded at 8:20 p.m.)

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATE

I, KRISTIN L. O'REILLY, Notary Public for the State of Alaska, and Registered Professional Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings were taken before me at the time and place herein set forth; that the proceedings were reported stenographically by me and later transcribed by computer transcription; that the foregoing is a true record of the proceedings taken at that time; and that I am not a party to, nor do I have any interest in, the outcome of the action herein contained.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my seal this 5th day of April, 2012.

Kristin L. O'Reilly
Notary Public, State of Alaska
My Commission Expires: 12/18/2014