

ALASKA POWER AUTHORITY
SUSITNA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT
SETTLEMENT PROCESS

POSITION PAPER DISCUSSION MEETING #3

March 22, 1985

Northern Lights Inn
598 W. Northern Lights Blvd.
Anchorage, Alaska

Old Business: Revised Papers R-5, W-9

New Business: Position Papers W-13, W-19, R-2, R-3, S-5, F-2.6, F-5, F-12

A T T E N D E E S

Jack Allen, KK and K
Tom Arminski, APA
Bruce Bedard, Tyonek/ CIRI Villages
Pam Bergmann, HE
John Bizer, HE
Bob Chlupach, ADF&G
Susan Ernst, HE
Randy Fairbanks, HE
Larry Gilbertson, HE
Chris Godfrey, EPA
David Harrison, Chickaloon Moose Creek
Jack Hession, KK and K
Mary Kaye Hession, KK and K
Hank Hosking, FWS
Rich Kornbrath, KK and K
Steve Koslow, KK and K

Mark Kuwada, ADF&G
Leroy Latta, ADNR
Bob Lindsay, HE
Jeff Lowenfels, BHB
Eric Marchegiani, APA
Dallas Owens, HE
Jim Richardson, KK and K
Jack Robinson, HE
Dan Rosenberg, ADF&G
Phil Scordelis, HE
Brad Smith, NMFS
Tom Stuart, HE
Rick Suttle, HE
Jim Thrall, HE
Sharon Vaissiere, HE
Jim Wolfe, FMAA

1 ALASKA POWER AUTHORITY
2 SUSITNA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT
3 SETTLEMENT PROCESS
4
5
6
7

8 TRANSCRIPT OF:
9 POSITION PAPER DISCUSSION MEETING #3
10
11

12 Date: 22 March 1985 Place: Denali Room .
13 Northern Lights Inn
14 Time: 8:30 a.m. 598 W. Northern Lights Blvd.
15 Anchorage, Alaska
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

ATTENDANCE ROSTER

1	ALASKA DEPT. FISH & GAME:	NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES
	Bob Chlupach	SERVICE:
2	Mark Kuwada	Brad Smith
	Dan Rosenberg	
3		TYONEK/CIRI:
	ALASKA POWER AUTHORITY:	BRUCE BEDARD
4	Tom Arminski	
	Eric Marchegiani	
5		
	BIRCH-HORTON:	
6	Jeff Lowenfels	
7		
	CHICKALOON MOOSE CREEK:	
8	David Harrison	
	DNR/LWM:	
9	Leroy Latta	
10		
	EPA:	
11	Chris Godfrey	
	FMAA:	
12	Jim Wolfe	
13		
	FISH & WILDLIFE SERVICE:	
14	Hank Hosking	
	HARZA-EBASCO:	
15	Pam Bergmann	
	John Bizer	
16	Susan Ernst	
	Randy Fairbanks	
17	Larry Gilbertson	
	Bob Lindsay	
18	Dallas Owens	
	Jack Robinson	
19	Phil Scordelis	
	Tom Stuart	
20	Rick Suttle	
	Jim Thrall	
21	Sharon Vaissiere	
22		
	KNIK KANOERS & KAYAKERS:	
23	Jack Allen	
	Jack Hession	
24	Mary Kaye Hession	
	Rich Kornbrath	
25	Steve Koslow	
	Jim Richardson	



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2 MR. ARMINSKI: I'm Tom Arminski. Roughly what we're
3 going to try to do in this meeting is to review each of these
4 issue papers, to resolve the issues if possible. If there
5 are any data gaps that you feel need to be addressed, we'd
6 like you to identify those so we can address them as soon as
7 possible. We'd like to review the analytical methods that
8 were used in the preparation of these issue papers, review
9 the mitigation measures for adequacy; or if you feel that
10 mitigation measures are lacking, you're welcome to suggest
11 additional mitigation measures for consideration. We'd like
12 to talk about the type of settlement instrument that might be
13 used to resolve this issue between the power authority and
14 agencies or intervenors. This might take the form of a
15 simple letter that says we agree with your position. It
16 might take the form of a fairly complex agreement between
17 the power authority and all the participants that would be
18 submitted to FERC and incorporated as a special license
19 stipulation. And the last item is to agree on any sort of
20 further action that we might need to resolve the issue. We've
21 got a settlement plan in the back that's been distributed to
22 each of the parties in the past. We haven't had any discussion
23 on that in the last two meetings. If there's anyone here
24 that hasn't been here before that would want to discuss that,
25 we can do that at this time. Sir? Okay.



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 MR. SMITH: Tom, could you maybe just briefly go over
2 that and explain how the follow-up meetings and such -- and
3 maybe where these meetings fits into the overall process.

4 MR. ARMINSKI: Okay. Generally, the way we've got this
5 thing set up is that we've developed position papers for 56
6 issues that have been identified. And these 56 issues come
7 from, I'd say, an exhaustive review of all the comments,
8 testimony to our Board, whatever, for the last for or five
9 years. And I think we went over something like 1500, 2,000
10 comments and distilled them down to basically 56 issues
11 that we think cover the spectrum of concerns. What we've
12 done is to prepare position papers that address each one of
13 those issues. And the position papers are capsulizations of
14 studies, statements made in the license application, comments
15 to FERC, whatever -- try to give a brief overview of each
16 issue so that a person that is not familiar with the issue
17 or doesn't have time to review a great number of documents
18 can get the flavor what what we're talking about here; and
19 also the proposed mitigation measures and our position with
20 respect to that issue. Now these things have been mailed
21 out to, probably, around 80 parties. All of the FERC
22 intervenors, all of the Federal agencies that are intervenors,
23 and then State and Federal agencies that are not intervenors.
24 So what we had hoped is that after reviewing these papers
25 the parties that are interested would meet with us in a forum



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 like this and discuss these points that I addressed earlier.
2 The ultimate goal would be to resolve these issues amongst
3 ourselves so that they wouldn't be subject to Federal FERC
4 in Washington D.C. What we want to do is try and work these
5 things out amongst ourselves here in Alaska and not leave it
6 to a Federal administrative law judge to impose license
7 stipulations or whatever on us that none of us might find a
8 best solution. This paper basically goes through that pro-
9 cess. The way we've got the meeting set up is that we have
10 a series of initial meetings to discuss the papers and then
11 we can have subsequent meetings to discuss any, you know,
12 new mitigation measures that are adopted or proposed; you
13 know, results of on-going studies, whatever. Down towards
14 late in the summer we hope to be able to enter into agreements
15 with the parties and -- The time line basically is dictated
16 by the FERC licensing schedule. The final EIS is supposed
17 to come out in September. Hearings would be ordered shortly
18 thereafter. We'd have a need for a power hearing first that
19 would last -- the hearing's actually very short. It's only
20 a few weeks, but then we've got -- we go into an environmental
21 hearing which -- we've got a fairly lengthy discovery period
22 and they set aside about six months for an evidentiary-type
23 hearing. So the total hearing process at FERC encompasses
24 about 20 months; and we'd like to avoid that if at all
25 possible. As I stated, we'd like to try and work things out



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 here in Alaska, and not leave our fates up to FERC. And
2 furthermore, I think we would like to avoid the expense and,
3 I'm sure, the burden of going through a long hearing in
4 Washington D.C. Does that basically answer the question?
5 Jeff, do you have anything to add to that?

6 MR. LOWENFELS: (Negative nod)

7 MR. ARMINSKI: Okay. One of the things that we've done
8 is discuss many of these papers in the previous two meetings.
9 And our plan is to, where there's been comments made, bring
10 these up as old business. And what I'll think we'll do is
11 quickly go through R-5 and W-9 that have been revised, and
12 then we'll change the order of the agenda here to address
13 our three whitewater boating first. I think there are a lot
14 of people that would like to leave after that one is discussed.
15 So with that, I think -- Rick, are you going to take.....

16 MR. SUTTLE: R-5?

17 MR. ARMINSKI: R-5.

18 MR. ROBINSON: I'd like to say a word. I'm Jack
19 Robinson. I might say a word with regard to the old business
20 papers, the papers that were revised based on participants'
21 comments in past meetings. The lines of the paper that were
22 changed from the version that was discussed in the previous
23 meetings is indicated in the right margin by a little
24 caret so that you can pick out what changes there were from
25 the last time you saw it. And in addition, on the title page



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 for the executive summary and the first page of the paper,
2 it says revision one so that you can distinguish that from
3 the one we talked about in past meetings.

4 MR. ARMINSKI: Dan Rosenberg.

5 MR. ROSENBERG: Would you give us a call or something
6 to let us know which ones -- which revised papers we'll be
7 discussing.....

8 MR. ARMINSKI: Okay.

9 MR. ROSENBERG:a little bit in advance?

10 MR. ARMINSKI: I think probably the easiest thing to
11 do is to call us because we don't really know with our
12 schedules exactly what we might have to discuss up 'til just
13 about the day before. But we can keep our receptionist
14 advised what the old business subjects would be, and if you
15 want to just call the Power Authority, probably at either of
16 the numbers, the Susitna office or the other office, we can
17 tell you what is going to be on the agenda. Okay? Rick?

18 MR. SUTTLE: R-5, it says: the significant impact
19 upon nonconsumptive activities, camping, hiking. We
20 discussed some of the comments. Most of the comments that
21 were incorporated were Bruce Bedard's; and on page 2 is the
22 first revision, the last paragraph; and what was added in was
23 the discussion on some of the features of local and/or
24 regional significance such as Stephan Lake, Fog Lake, and
25 Clarence Lake. And the on page 8 on the marks, on the very



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 last one there, it came out a little more strongly that the
2 Native landowners are interested. I think the last one said
3 appear to be interested. And the addition of adding to --
4 and the State, the very last sentence was added to that, in
5 addition to tour companies. Then finally the revision was
6 on the very last page, page 9, where we discussed developed
7 facilities may also be constructed by Native landowners near
8 Fog Lake, located immediately south of Watana Dam, near the
9 north end of Stephan Lake. Anyone that has questions, we
10 can talk about it now, or we can discuss it later after
11 you've had a chance to look over it. That's fine.

12 MR. ARMINSKI: Brad.....

13 MR. SMITH: I have more of a procedural question here.
14 Have these been mailed out, or were they just handed out
15 today?

16 MR. ARMINSKI: I believe they were just handed out
17 today.

18 MR. SMITH: Now, does this constitute what you say is a
19 follow-up meeting for these issues, or what are you doing
20 here?

21 MR. ARMINSKI: Yeah, I would say that this would begin
22 the -- would be the beginning follow-up meeting for these
23 issues.

24 MR. SMITH: Okay. I was under the impression that we'd
25 establish a date for the follow-up meetings, and meet just to



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 talk about that one particular issue. Would that be
2 possible or.....

3 MR. ARMINSKI: It would.

4 MR. SMITH: Okay. I'd suggest that that be done, then.
5 I don't think you're going to get a lot of feedback with
6 this type of procedure.

7 MR. ARMINSKI: Okay.

8 MR. THRALL: I thought that we had a discussion where
9 we thought, maybe, that in some cases we could just present
10 these as old business at a forum like this where there's
11 not -- appear not to be real controversial, changes could be
12 made, and then follow-up meetings could be scheduled if it
13 is perceived to be necessary. Was that.....

14 MR. ARMINSKI: I think that was my understanding. That
15 was our first meeting discussion, Brad. I don't think you
16 were.....

17 MR. SMITH: Oh, I wasn't at the first meeting.

18 MR. ARMINSKI: I think one thing is clear to keep in
19 mind, that nothing precludes, you know, anyone from bringing
20 up old business at any time; anytime, you know, someone
21 wants to bring this one back up again at the next meeting
22 as old business if it has some additional problem. But maybe
23 we need to resolve this a little more clearly.

24 MR. SMITH: I think you have to add a little more
25 structure to this process or it's going to get awfully



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 cluttered. However, what you said sounds logical, but I
2 would at least like to see a mailing of these updates before
3 they're discussed.

4 MR. THRALL: We're trying to sort of balance, you know.
5 budgets and deadlines and everything else and numbers of
6 meetings against -- so we need to keep it structured. Maybe
7 that's something we need to take under advisement, think on
8 and report back on at the next meeting; come back with some
9 additional thoughts.

10 MR. ROSENBERG: Rick, did you get Fish and Game's comments
11 on this paper?

12 MR. SUTTLE: You may not have. I apologize. They got
13 out real late, so I'd like to be able to go through it.
14 They've been sent over now. I don't know if you've
15 received.....

16 MR. ARMINSKI: No, we haven't received them yet.

17 MR. ROSENBERG: I'd like to just go through this and
18 discuss it with you later.

19 MR. ARMINSKI: Any more discussion on R-5? Okay. The
20 next item is an old business, W-9. This is a paper that
21 dealt with the impact of support facilities on wildlife
22 habitat. Randy, please.

23 MR. FAIRBANKS: Okay. In W-9 we made changes in
24 basically four areas. One was there was a mitigation measure
25 which, essentially -- that was listed in the previous paper



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3643

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 that listed the production of wetland, refined wetland maps,
2 as a mitigation measure that was suggested. That was really
3 a tool for impact assessment and not necessarily a mitigation
4 measure, so that was deleted from the mitigation measure list.
5 Mitigation measure 5, the wording "develop a plan" was changed to
6 "implement a plan"; and that was pertaining to implementing
7 a site rehabilitation plan. And then the comment was made
8 that in the Watana area some of the support facilities are
9 sited in areas that have relatively high value as black bear
10 foraging habitat; and that was incorporated into the text in
11 several different places. And then finally, there was a
12 comment regarding mitigation measure 8 that we should change
13 the wording "compensation lands" to "mitigation lands"; and
14 that was done. So everything that was changed, as Jack
15 indicated earlier, is indicated by a caret in the right
16 margin. The only thing you won't see with a caret is the
17 deletion of that one mitigation measure that was in the
18 previous paper.

19 MR. ARMINSKI: If you'd like, you know, we can bring
20 this up next week.

21 MR. FAIRBANKS: Okay. Yeah, let's go back and look at
22 it again.

23 MR. ARMINSKI: Okay, we'll do that. We'll bring it
24 up again. Okay. Now for the one everyone's been waiting
25 for. New business. This is the significance of loss of



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 whitewater resources. The Power Authority feels that the
2 impact of this project will be significant on whitewater
3 resources. There will be a loss. We believe we can provide
4 some compensation for this, but we will not be able to
5 totally mitigate the loss. The significance is somewhat
6 balanced, I think, by the somewhat low number of people
7 that use the resource on an annual basis, but that's not to
8 say that that loss isn't significant to those people. Susan
9 Ernst is going to discuss this paper.

10 MS. ERNST: Okay. First I'd like to start by adding
11 an additional mitigation measure that was omitted. This
12 was an oversight. There will be some access out of both
13 reservoirs, provided from construction access of each
14 reservoir. We'll have some kind of access that will enable
15 people to put in near the Denali Highway and travel down
16 and access out of the reservoirs. And as far as our approach,
17 it consisted of: We first investigated from the background
18 information we had which consisted of, primarily, an article
19 on Devil's Canyon that was published in the American White-
20 water Affiliation Journal. We consulted various river
21 guides published on the Susitna River. We referred to
22 correspondence that had been sent between members of the
23 Knik Kanoers and Kayakers and the APA in recent years. And
24 we also discussed the issue with various representations of
25 national river organizations, including the organization of



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 rivers for the American Whitewater Affiliation and the
2 American Canoe Association. We also discussed the issue with
3 some local kayakers and a nationally known kayaker from
4 Idaho who has kayaked the Devil Canyon. Are there any
5 comments on that?

6 MR. KORNBATH: The new mitigation measure that
7 provides the access, is that -- what's the story on the
8 maintenance of the road? Is that an on-going thing where
9 it will be maintained, or is it going to go the route of,
10 like, the Burma road?

11 MR. ARMINSKI: What we would have to do if we provided
12 the access -- the access as we envision it right now would
13 be the use of a construction road down to the reservoir.
14 And if it's agreed that this is a needed recreational facility,
15 to provide egress and ingress for boaters, we would maintain
16 that. It would become one of the operation and maintenance
17 costs for the project.

18 MR. KORNBATH: Okay.

19 MR. ARMINSKI: Jim.

20 MR. RICHARDSON: Maybe just to sort of structure some
21 of the comments that you may get: There's a number of
22 people here that are recreational boaters. That's what you
23 have a resource to talk to here. In reviewing this, we had
24 a general feeling that there's a number of facts presented
25 here. There's nothing really wrong with the data, but some



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 of us do have a problem with the way it's presented; that
2 way being: providing information in a way which gives the
3 opinion of lessening the impact. And we would like to
4 discuss several of those issues and will be able to contri-
5 bute as individuals to that. And after we get through the
6 list of information about that, then we have some additional
7 mitigation measures to propose and to discuss with you.
8 There are a lot of us here that are not very familiar with the
9 process that you are going through, and much of our information
10 on the project is gleaned from the newspaper. Maybe you
11 could clarify for us what it is that you're talking about.
12 Are you still talking about two-dam system? Are we talking
13 about a single dam at Watana with the lower race? That has
14 some real impact on what it is that we're talking about in
15 terms of impact.

16 MR. ARMINSKI: Do you want me to address that right now?

17 MR. RICHARDSON: That would help.

18 MR. ARMINSKI: Okay. What's currently proposed is a
19 two-dam system. It's the same, ultimately, as was presented
20 in the FERC license; the difference being that Watana would
21 not be built to the full height initially. So there would
22 be a lower Watana constructed. The Devil Canyon project
23 would be constructed as proposed and then some time in the
24 future, we'd go back and raise Watana to the ultimate height.
25 So that's basically what the project is. The reason for



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 doing this is that it decreases the initial cost of constru-
2 tion, although it ultimately results in a higher cost of
3 construction for the entire project. But we can meet the
4 low projection, low growth projections, more closely with
5 that instead of having a big incremental increase in
6 capacity. We raise the capacity in three steps rather than
7 in two. So that's the rationale behind it.

8 MR. RICHARDSON: Well, that does help us talk about it.
9 I had been reading in the paper for the last quite a bit of
10 while about a single dam structure that was being considered
11 as sort of a fall back. That's not.....

12 MR. ARMINSKI: Well, it's not economic -- I should say
13 it is economic to build just Watana, but the cost benefit
14 ratio, I think it's just a little over one. And you know, if
15 you're going to sink that much money into something, you'd
16 want to develop it to the extent where you got the best
17 benefit out of it. And secondly, with just Watana alone,
18 you could never -- you can't operate it at full capacity
19 because you've got a problem where to meet the environmental
20 constraints, the flow requirements, you'd have to just
21 primarily, what we'd say, base load it. You could never use
22 it as sort of a peaking project. Devil Canyon, on line
23 downstream, you can peak Watana. And then you can -- your
24 flows out of Devil Canyon can be moderate, you know, so that
25 you don't have major fluctuations.



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 MR. RICHARDSON: Some of the power flow implications
2 aren't really necessary to us, but in terms of our mitigation
3 measures, what we can discuss, it really makes a big
4 difference. So I think we'd better make a differentiation
5 when we're talking about it; and perhaps suggest if we're
6 talking about a single dam structure, some mitigation measures
7 may be appropriate, and if we're talking about a system those
8 will not be appropriate.

9 MR. ARMINSKI: We're talking about two dams.

10 MR. LOWENFELS: Yeah, we're talking about a system.
11 Let me just correct -- correct is not the proper word. The
12 proposal to stage the project has not been approved by the
13 Power Authority board. It's a proposal that seems to make
14 a lot of sense, and it's one that people are talking about
15 as making a lot of sense as being an alternate to putting
16 a lot of up front State dollars into the project. But the
17 license application, as it's currently on file, is for a
18 two-dam project without staging.

19 MR. RICHARDSON: Okay. That clarifies it. Thank you.

20 MR. ROSENBERG: I'm under the impression that everything
21 we're discussing now is just the two-dam project staging.

22 MR. ARMINSKI: That's right.

23 MR. ALLEN: What is the cost benefit ratio of the
24 whole thing?

25 MR. ARMINSKI: As proposed now? I think it's 1.43.



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 MR. RICHARDSON: Well, maybe I can just start out now
2 we're going through here. In discussing several of the
3 points within this paper that we feel could have used a little
4 bit of change. I guess one first item -- and I'd like other
5 people to sort of chip in on these items -- is that we don't
6 feel that the future use of the river was discussed at all
7 in terms of how to evaluate the significance of the impact
8 of the loss. The figures are given that this hasn't
9 received a great deal of use in the past, and therefore that
10 level of use would continue indefinitely into the future.
11 And I don't think that that is a valid assertion. At one
12 point in time the Colorado River was used at a very low
13 level, and now that situation has changed very dramatically.
14 The river was first run, basically, in the 1970's. It hasn't
15 had a great period of use. It's not extremely well known.
16 But the number of recreational boaters within the State of
17 Alaska is increasing as -- if you walk down to any of the
18 sporting good stores and find out the number of boats that
19 they're selling -- that information will be clear to you.
20 And secondly, there's a lot of people that come up from all
21 over the country and from other countries to go recreational
22 boating within the State of Alaska. So that demand is
23 uncertain, but it is very unlikely to remain the same. That
24 is one issue. Maybe I could throw it open for comments.

25 MR. ALLEN: Let me add to that, Jim. I basically felt



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 it was a good paper, and it obviously did a very thorough job
2 of gathering material. But I think the thing that was
3 missed is something that we feel very strongly about, and
4 that is that the Susitna River really is a unique river. I
5 mean, it's one of a kind. There are other difficult rivers
6 in Alaska and in the rest of the country, and the paper
7 mentions a couple of them, but they really don't compare
8 to the Susitna in terms of the volume and the continuous
9 section of water. You know, every river has one or two
10 drops that are unrunnable, but here is a river that really
11 is accurately compared to Mount Everest. It's a nationally
12 famous river; and of course, it's very difficult. I, myself,
13 wouldn't consider running it. But there are a lot of local
14 boaters who do, and have, and that number will increase.
15 But more importantly this is a river that kayakers anywhere
16 in the country know about, and it's part of a -- you know,
17 there are a lot of people that wouldn't consider climbing
18 Mount Everest, but it's something that, I think, has value
19 simply because of its uniqueness. And I think the use of
20 it will increase. But even though the use, you know, may
21 not compare in terms of the number of people that would take
22 a motorboat out on the reservoir, still there are plenty of
23 lakes in the world, plenty of reservoirs, but there is only
24 one Devil's Canyon. I think that's the point that we feel
25 is really not adequately reflected in this paper.



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3643

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 MR. HESSION: I can add that it's free-flowing, the
2 Susitna River, as well, I was just thinking of the large
3 whitewater rivers in the Lower 48. A number of those are
4 dammed. Those are what boaters call release rivers; the
5 Grand Canyon, for example. But here you have not only
6 a spectacularly big water, it's a natural system. I
7 think that ought to be at least recognized. You mentioned
8 in your paper the Kosina and the Nellie Juan. We have
9 a member here today, Steve Koslow, down at the end of
10 the table, who's been down the Nellie Juan. We know here
11 of the Kosina, which is in the Wrangells. Those are
12 relatively small type or technical rivers, as boaters
13 refer to them. And they simply don't compare with the
14 Susitna. They're not even in the same league. I'm not
15 downgrading them or criticizing them, I'm just pointing
16 out that it's an entirely different sort of proposition.
17 Steve, do you want to comment on the Nellie Juan?

18 MR. KOSLOW: Yeah, I've found that -- I've never
19 paddled the Susitna. I've been up a few times to run the
20 river, but due to weather conditions, I wasn't able to fly
21 in. And I'm that caliber of a boater, and there are more
22 than a dozen of those boaters in the State of Alaska, which
23 has a very small population of kayakers as compared to the
24 rest of the country. I think the Susitna has a great

25

* * * * *



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 potential for a lot more use. And the other rivers that you
2 mentioned, the Kosina and the Nellie Juan, also are quite
3 incredible rivers in themselves, too, but they certainly
4 don't even come close to the scale that the Susitna River has.
5 The Nellie Juan is a small volume; it maybe peaks at 4,000
6 cfs as opposed to the Susitna which is up to 10 times that
7 much. It's difficult in that its portages and its waterfalls
8 are very spectacular. The wildlife is incredible. The
9 scenery's incredible with glaciers coming down to the river
10 and et cetera. But the Susitna is still set apart from that.
11 It's just a completely different system. I'd feel real
12 sorry to start from different altitudes. I think that would
13 be a real shame.

14 MS. ERNST: Could I ask you: Would you say that the
15 main difference between the Susitna and these others is
16 the volume?

17 MR. KOSLOW: I'd say the scale of the river, the size
18 of the river, certainly, the hydraulics are of a scale that
19 you just don't find.

20 MR. ALLEN: In fact, you can put whitewater into two
21 different categories: technical rivers and big volume
22 rivers. The Kosina and the Nellie Juan are on the technical
23 side; small, but difficult because highly constricted by
24 rocks and boulders. The Susitna is the big volume. And we
25 have some other rivers. The Nenana is probably as close as



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 that. The Lowe near Valdez is a fairly big volume river,
2 but the Susitna is a very big volume river with a very
3 restricted flow which creates really unique hydraulics,
4 unique wave actions; and as they say, for that reason, it's
5 really famous outside of Alaska.

6 MR. KORNBATH: I'd like to make a few comments on that.
7 I was part of a three-man, two-woman team that went there
8 in '81; and we took a paddle raft, one single raft, from
9 the Denali Highway and made our way down to Gold Creek
10 Bridge. Part of the river above the canyon almost epitomizes
11 the interior Alaskan type of major river system. It's got
12 spectacular scenery and wildlife. And a point to be made
13 about that, I think, is that -- I'm a geologist. I spend
14 a lot of time in helicopters. And to really address the
15 resource value by flying through the canyon and landing, or
16 landing at various gravel bars, is just a lot different than
17 making your way on water or on foot through the entire
18 system. When you have to work that hard for something, you
19 appreciate it a lot more. And I think you have to take that
20 in consideration when you're addressing the value of a
21 resource. When we got to Devil's Canyon -- we'd used air
22 photos and maps and reconnaissance flights to identify where
23 the rapids were. There are four major sets of rapids that
24 run anywhere from a half mile to two miles long, and we
25 portaged three of those. We set the trip up in such a way



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 where each member had a backpack. One carried the raft.
2 The others carried the waterproof bags with gear and food
3 and tents and what not. Portaged one set of rapids. Camp
4 out along the side and photograph the rapids. Spend a few
5 days there, then we would float a few miles of river down
6 to the next set of major rapids, take out, portage that,
7 spend a couple days, and make our way down the canyon in
8 that way. And that trip is perfectly feasible. There's
9 only one, what I would call difficult, very difficult
10 portage, and that's the last portage that takes you down to
11 the river at the bottom of the canyon. The access for
12 getting out above that last set of rapids, which incidentally
13 starts approximately at the location of the Devil's Canyon
14 Dam -- the access for getting out is quite easy. There's
15 the old airstrip there, and there's an overgrown road that
16 gets you up to the canyon rim about 500 feet above the water
17 level; and then you hike about a mile-and-a-half along that
18 rim looking down all the time on this spectacular gorge;
19 and then your access getting back into the canyon is rela-
20 tively difficult. Somebody maybe could find a better way,
21 but we were in a position where we had to use ropes to get
22 down there and get our gear down there. But.....

23 MR. SUTTLE: Excuse me. are you on the south --
24 you're talking about the south side?

25 MR. KORNBRATH: South side, right. And, you know, I've



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 suggested to other boaters, and I intend myself to go back
2 and do the same trip. What the Susitna has is it has
3 options. You can go to the head of the canyon or you can
4 head over to Stephan Lake and get out that way, or you can
5 take a more difficult trip, and if you have the skills,
6 someone like Steve, you can run rapids, or you can portage
7 some rapids and run other rapids, or you can portage all the
8 rapids. All of those options are perfectly feasible. That's
9 mainly the point I wanted to make. It looks a lot different
10 on the ground and on the water than it does when you're
11 flying around and stopping. It is unique. It is a unique
12 resource.

13 MR. RICHARDSON: Just to back up one step. A couple
14 of the characteristics of the river which are not present
15 in some of the other rivers that were suggested of other
16 Class VI rivers that are in the State of Alaska: The
17 Susitna, the Devil's Canyon creek, is continuous. It can be
18 run from one end to the other if water levels are appropriate.
19 You don't need to portage around. And that continuous run
20 -- kayakers are inordinately fond of being able to run an
21 entire system without having to get out and go around
22 obstacles. So that is very important. Something else that
23 follows on uniqueness: The discussion that is -- I think
24 it's on the bottom of page 3 -- that says that this river --
25 sort of supporting the fact that in the paper this was not



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 a unique system, says that this river was not included as --
2 it's not a wild and scenic river, and it wasn't included
3 under ANILCA. And there are reasons for that, and maybe
4 some other people can comment on that.

5 MR. HESSION: I'll take that point up. In the House
6 passed bill, HR 39, the Big Susitna was a so-called study
7 river, in a pencil edition of the wild and scenic river study,
8 that simply did not survive the negotiations that went on,
9 and eventually it was dropped out. Backing up to Rich's
10 comment, I would like you to recognize more clearly
11 the significance of the upper Susitna, Talkeetna combination.
12 I think that is - I would rate that as a wilderness trip of
13 the very highest in Alaska. It also has another feature
14 that is very valuable from the point of view of river users,
15 and that is it's road accessible at both ends. It's in
16 central Alaska, readily accessible from both Anchorage
17 and Fairbanks. In other words, you don't have to spend
18 hundreds of dollars to get into a wilderness river run
19 that's comparable to anything else in Alaska. You're in
20 there right now under existing conditions. You might as
21 well be in far southwest Alaska, in the arctic. It's
22 comparable to wilderness anywhere in Alaska in my opinion.
23 So if you can discuss the project in those terms, we still
24 have a major resource about Devil's Canyon rapids, in other
25 words, in terms of a wilderness run, a whitewater run, that's



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 outstanding.

2 MR. KORNBRATH: Yeah, I think it's just a matter of
3 time before you see commercial operators, if in fact the
4 dams aren't built, operating on that river, because it's
5 the type of experience that the tourist industry is going
6 to jump right on to. The future use of the river, it may
7 surprise us all. It's that unique of a resource.

8 MR. RICHARDSON: Maybe I can throw out another point.

9 MR. ARMINSKI: Jim?

10 MR. RICHARDSON: Sure.

11 MR. ARMINSKI: Would you fill out your name tag so
12 that she can get your name every time you speak?

13 MR. RICHARDSON: Let's see if I can talk while I write
14 here. Another point that's made in terms of, I think, giving
15 the impression of lessening the impact of the potential loss
16 of the river system is the point in the paper that says it's
17 a Native ownership and that the owners of the land are
18 considering restricting access to the land at this point
19 because of their concern over liability. I would suggest
20 that that's an irrelevant point. There is a lot of land
21 in the State of Alaska that is in private ownership and
22 people get access to use that for recreational purposes. We
23 as a person, as a boater, as a club, you don't need to go
24 further than Eagle River to see an example where there's a
25 heavily used river resource that is on Native-owned land.



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 And we have been able, and have to be in the future continue
2 to be able to have cooperative agreements. We work with
3 the Eklutna Corporation. We get a license from them to run
4 the Alaska Championship -- we being the Knik Kanoers and
5 Kayakers -- run the Alaska Championship Slalom race. If
6 you go out there in the first week of August, it has hundreds
7 -- you know, last year there was probably about 500 spectators
8 lining the banks of the river, and I believe 60 participants
9 in a slalom race. It's a fun event for us and it's a fun
10 event for other people that takes place partially on Eklutna
11 land. We have a history of being able to use land. And I
12 don't think that's something that's appropriate to throw out
13 as something to say: Well, we're not going to be able to
14 use it anyway.

15 MR. ARMINSKI: Well, let me just say that the reason
16 it's in here is the Native communities brought that up.
17 Bruce, do you want to say anything about that?

18 MR. BEDARD: Unlike Eklutna, you've got to realize
19 that you're dealing with different Native groups. Tyonek
20 happens to be the owner of this particular area that you're
21 talking about. It is their desire that -- because of
22 liability and because of trust rights and possible abuses
23 of trust rights, that we may close that stretch because it
24 is non-navigable; and like it or not, it may happen.

25 MR. MARCHEGIANI: When you say that, Bruce -- my name's



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 Eric Marchegiani. When you say that it's non-navigable, just so that Jim
2 knows, what does that mean? Does that mean that you own land underneath
3 the water? Does that mean that you just own up to the water?

4 MR. BEDARD: Of non-navigable land, we own straight across.

5 MR. MARCHEGIANI: So.....

6 MR. BEDARD: So it's up in the air about the water
7 issue. That's something that I don't want to discuss. But
8 as far as -- what I'm stating is that because of the rapids,
9 the danger of the rapids, it's become important. And some
10 of the people that have run the rapids have drowned in that
11 area. And we don't want that to occur. The mineral interest
12 is CIRI. The service interest is the village corporation.
13 And we've discussed quite heavily about the particular use.
14 Our feelings is that if the dam did go, you're looking at a
15 Class VI rapid, at present, could possibly be downgraded to
16 a Class II with a dam in place. And it is our opinion that
17 below the dam you would have more use than you have now
18 because of the dangers of running it as a Class VI. You can
19 disagree with me, but that's our option.

20 MR. ALLEN: Let me ask a question there. First of all,
21 let me make a comment that the trespass concern, I think,
22 is a legitimate concern, that the adjoining landowner has
23 the right to close his land to trespassers. I think the
24 liability concern is a red herring. I don't know of any
25 case where ownership of a river has been a basis for liability



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 of accident to a boater. If it were, the State of Alaska
2 which owns a lot of river beds would be sued everyday,
3 because people are hurt on rivers all over the State. But
4 I think when you try to throw in liability you really are
5 stretching it. Trespass is a legitimate concern.

6 MR. BEDARD: Well, looking at the legal profession and
7 the way people are suing in this day and age, it's hard to
8 tell, you know. And we just don't want to open Pandora's
9 box to a possible lawsuit.

10 MR. ALLEN: My other thought was if that's the attitude
11 of the adjoining landowners, then does that mean that the
12 reservoir if it's built will be inaccessible for boating use?
13 I mean, there's.....

14 MR. ARMINSKI: Leroy from DNR.

15 MR. LATIA: I was just going to say in the application
16 you have 200 foot linear above the highest water, so.....

17 MR. ALLEN: The project boundary doesn't stand.....

18 MR. LATIA:how to get to that bend, I don't know.

19 MR. ALLEN: The final thing I want to get to is the
20 use point you make as to the usability of the river below
21 the dam. We're very concerned about what kind of release
22 schedule we can expect if the dam is built. And I think
23 the paper, if I recall, seems to indicate that either the
24 release will be so low from the lower dam, the Devil's
25 Canyon Dam, that the remainder of the rapids below the dam



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3643

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 will not be runable at all, or that the water will be
2 conducted through a penstock below that thing and put back
3 into the river below; is that the case?

4 MS. ERNST: That is the case. The entire Devil
5 Canyon rapids will be either inundated or largely dewatered.
6 There may be some releases from the cone valves.

7 MR. ALLEN: So what is the Class III whitewater that
8 they're talking about? Where would that.....

9 MR. BEDARD: You've still got quite a bit of cfs
10 running out of there. You've got the flow from Portage
11 Creek, which is a pretty good size flow as well, not too
12 far down from where the proposed dam is. That particular
13 canyon, because it is a canyon, and even down river of the
14 dam, you're still looking at a mile-and-a-half of canyon
15 walls downriver of where the proposed dam is going to be.
16 You're going to have a flow; and that flow, based on what
17 I'm reading in their flow reports, is sizeable enough to
18 be a Class III whitewater.

19 MS. HESSION: Can we get this straight. What do you say
20 this flow would be immediately downstream from Devil
21 Canyon? Is it dewatered or is there several thousand cfs?

22 MR. ERNST: From the dam to a point immediate up-
23 stream from Portage Creek, that portion will be almost always
24 dewatered. There'll be some occasions when there is some
25 water. Downstream of Portage Creek there will be flows.



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 MR. ALLEN: Is that 8,000?

2 MR. ERNST: That's on page 8. Median, 9,000; minimum, 8,000.

3 MR. HESSION: I'd like to also point out that the
4 question of navigability is as yet unresolved.

5 MR. BEDARD: Not on that question, because the portion
6 of the river from Portage Creek to Devil's Creek is -- we've
7 already got an easement document and a BLM conveyance
8 document giving us title to that stretch of the area.

9 MR. HESSION: All right.

10 MR. BEDARD: The rest of the river is in question.

11 MR. HESSION: I was referring to the pending Gulkana
12 River case in which the State of Alaska is attempting to
13 have the river determined navigable on the basis of kayak,
14 canoe, raft use.

15 BEDARD: I don't think that's going to fly, but.....

16 MR. HESSION: I don't know whether it's going to fly
17 either, but it strikes me until that test of navigability
18 is determined by the courts one way or the other, I don't
19 think we can assume ownership based on present navigability
20 determinations.

21 MR. BEDARD: It's already been done, so.....

22 MR. HESSION: Well, you look at.....

23 MR. BEDARD: We've got title to it, so it'll be.....

24 MR. HESSION: You'd be out of business. It'd revert
25 to State ownership if it can be shown to be navigable.



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 MR. BEDARD: Well, regardless, what I'm saying is that
2 we own the land to the mean high water mark. You still have
3 to portage.

4 MR. HESSION: Well, maybe it's possible to portage
5 below the mean high water mark.

6 MR. BEDARD: I doubt it.

7 MR. LATTA: It would be the mean high water mark
8 before construction, so if it's dewatered you could walk.

9 MR. BEDARD: No, but without the dam is what I'm
10 getting out. I'm just arguing the point of navigability.

11 MR. HESSION: Could you describe for us the stretch of
12 river that your corporations own land on?

13 MR. HARRISON: We own it all.

14 MR. BEDARD: You mean the entire stretch?

15 MR. HESSION: No, what portion of the river from, say,
16 Gull Creek upstream, the Sirian and the Tyonek.

17 MR. BEDARD: Are you talking about what we have
18 claimed or what.....

19 MR. HESSION: The lands abutting the rapids. Whatever,
20 you know.

21 MR. BEDARD: What we claimed is roughly just a little
22 bit north of Gold Creek all the way to up beyond Watana
23 Creek, about 80 miles or 90 miles of river.

24 MR. HESSION: So that's selected status then?

25 MR. BEDARD: Yes. It will be conveyed.



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3643

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 MR. HESSION: So you have applied for it?

2 MR. BEDARD: No. We've already got it's on the major
3 portion of the river. There's a questionable stretch that
4 we do not have the title yet to, and that supposedly is
5 supposed to take place shortly, within March or April.
6 142,000 acres is to be conveyed this month or next month.
7 They presently have conveyed about 60,000 acres of land up
8 there. We will have about 215,000 acres, total acres, in
9 that area which is both sides of the river, that whole
10 stretch.

11 MR. HESSION: Let's assume for the moment that the
12 dams are not built for one reason or another. Would you
13 still proceed with your selections?

14 MR. BEDARD: Oh, yeah. Our selections are concrete.
15 We're stuck with them whether we want them or not, and
16 that was not our only criteria in selecting this land.
17 There's other criteria: mineral development, timber
18 development, recreational development as well as residential
19 and business.

20 MR. KORNBRATH: Getting back to the whitewater.
21 The bottom line, it seems to me -- what I hear is: With
22 the dams in place there will not be any boaters going up
23 there to run whitewater. In other words, that last set of
24 rapids in the gorge below the Devil's Canyon Dam will be
25 dewatered or will be partly tailrace, and that section is



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 only about three-quarters of a mile long anyway. It's
2 petered out when you hit Portage Creek, the actual white-
3 water rapids. Okay. So you won't have that. You will,
4 certainly be getting boaters up there to do a semi-wilder-
5 ness float from Portage Creek down to Talkeetna or wherever
6 they want to go, but that is basically flatwater boating.

7 MR. HARRISON: Well, before this dam even gets started
8 I think you better get tribal consent, otherwise you are
9 illegal. The State of Alaska does not have no authority.
10 The Federal government cannot appropriate Indian lands
11 without tribal consent. Therefore, this Alaska Native Claims
12 Settlement Act that all you people think we have a law is
13 genocidal and it's seditious and it's illegal.

14 MR. ALLEN: Weren't there any site easements imposed
15 on your ic?

16 MR. BEDARD: Well, the easements are in kind of unusual
17 spots. There is no easement on the Devil's Canyon stretch.
18 The easements are just coming down the bend below where the
19 proposed Watana Dam is, and where it come like this, the
20 river. It looks like a dipper. That's the easement. That's
21 the ingress to go on this side. So it's a one-acre site
22 with a small trail.

23 MR. ALLEN: And what was the purpose of putting those
24 easements on there?

25 MR. BEDARD: Well, you're probably aware that the



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3643

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 easement -- the Natives have taken the position that the
2 easements for recreational purposes are not proper, but the
3 easement for ingress and egress is proper use, and to get
4 from private lands to public lands is a proper use. Other
5 than that, they don't identify recreational uses.

6 MR. ALLEN: Well, did the BLM determine that the river
7 itself was an access route from public land to public land
8 and was therefore entitled to have site easements?

9 MR. BEDARD: No.

10 MR. ALLEN: So they just put one access easement?

11 MR. BEDARD: There's an access easement going across
12 the land at Gold Creek, an existing ATV trail that was put
13 in by the miners way back when. It's to Stephan Lake.
14 There's another access coming from State lands to Upper
15 Lake in the Fog Lake district to one of the lakes only, but
16 it doesn't go through. It stops right there because there's
17 a 40-acre private landholder there.

18 MR. ALLEN: It's a legal access from the river to
19 Stephan Lake?

20 MR. BEDARD: Yes. That's the other access. It's a
21 trail only, from the river coming down about a mile-and-a-half
22 to the north end of Stephan Lake. In our proposal, we're
23 proposing recreational planning for that area, We're
24 trying to cooperate with the State's plan.

25 MR. ALLEN: Would it be possible to legally get to the



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 river and get out without trespassing on Native lands?

2 MR. BEDARD: Not if you're going to go through Devil's
3 Canyon. Myself, I don't mind kayaking myself. Unless
4 you're real brave, I wouldn't go down through Devil Canyon.

5 MR. ALLEN: Well, I wouldn't either. But the upper
6 part of the river, you could legally access it and get out
7 by Stephan Lake without trespassing?

8 MR. BEDARD: Well, you still got the problem of Prairie
9 Creek where you're going to trespass there.

10 MR. ALLEN: Is that all Native?

11 MR. BEDARD: That's all Native owned, the entire stretch...

12 MR. HESSION: How do you.....

13 MR. BEDARD:including the upper part of the
14 Talkeetna River.

15 MR. HESSION: Excuse me. I want to follow that point
16 up. How do you trespass if you float down Prairie Creek?

17 MR. BEDARD: You can't float Prairie Creek without
18 getting -- you'd have to float. It's just that you can't
19 get a raft.....

20 MR. KOSLOW: I've paddled that river for the last seven
21 years, and I've been able to negotiate the whole river
22 without getting out of it.

23 MR. BEDARD: It must have been real high water.

24 MR. HESSION: Well, I've been down it, too, and I
25 didn't get out and portage. Several of us here have.



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 MR. ALLEN: Well, I've got to say, yeah, there are log
2 jams.

3 MR. BEDARD: That's what I'm getting at.

4 MR. ALLEN: You've got to portage the log jams.
5 And if that's a non-navigable river, as I'm sure it is,
6 you'd be in trespass as soon as you climbed around the log
7 jam.

8 MR. SUTTLE: I think, to bring this around to the
9 position paper again -- I think the reason that the Native
10 land ownership is discussed in here is with respect to
11 bringing it out with regards to the future use that you
12 mentioned earlier, Jim. And it is a point, trying to
13 protect the future use -- I think it's something that needs
14 to be brought out and made reflective to the total use; I
15 guess another point on future use that I want to make to
16 help us to better project that. A good place to start is
17 with the existing use. And that's something where maybe
18 you can -- maybe later here address, the use information
19 you have in the paper; or later on we can discuss, if you
20 have updated information on that. That would sure help us.

21 MR. ALLEN: Let me just add a point. We are very
22 mindful of trespass and of the need to respect those private
23 landowners' rights. We feel that one of the reasons the
24 Natives selected this land was to develop it for its recrea-
25 tional potential. And of course, we're part of the recreational



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 community. We expect the Natives are going to be interested
2 in reaching some accommodation with us after we get past the
3 stage of we-they, genocide, et cetera, et cetera. Then we'll
4 start to work together and, you know, I don't think that the
5 trespass is an insurmountable issue.

6 MR. BEDARD: Like I said, our trespass concerns on
7 Prairie Creek drainage is of concern there, but I don't believe
8 the intent of Knik and of Tyonek who own that stretch, the
9 Prairie Creek stretch -- is not to close that. But the
10 intent was to be concerned about the liability of the
11 rafters in Devil Canyon. And due to the fact that there are
12 some mineral interests there -- as you said, you're a
13 geologist --there's the concern of the amateur rockhouser
14 and recreational miner getting in that area and getting
15 into that, and we don't want that to occur. And a lot of
16 it has happened in the past only because they aren't aware
17 that that's not State or Federal land. They don't know that
18 it's not public land. And shortly you'll see things coming
19 out in the paper bringing that out, like we did in Beluga
20 and you're aware that we did open Beluga to recreational
21 permit. You have to have a permit to go in there. There's
22 a fee for that.

23 MR. ALLEN: And that's as it should be. You have a
24 resource and you're entitled to.....

25 MR. BEDARD: So like I said, there's a lot of things



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 that we have identified in Prairie Creek as one of the
2 things we're incorporating into our recreational plan.
3 But in Devil Canyon we have very, very grave concerns about
4 that because people have, you know, gotten killed in that
5 canyon.

6 MR. ALLEN: Well, nobody has yet -- no landowner has yet
7 been held liable simply for owning the bed of a river that
8 somebody's killed on.

9 MR. BEDARD: Well, there's always the chance of a lawsuit.
10 And lawsuits, whether they occur or not can occur if someone
11 gets killed. And some family feels: The Natives own it.
12 I'll try suing them. And when the Federal government owns
13 the land, or public lands, they can't sue. So when private
14 owners own something, everyone's out to sue you.

15 MS. HESSION: Of course, in the Lower 48 most of the
16 waterways are surrounded by private land. I'm not aware of
17 any instance where the landowner was held liable for some-
18 body's boating accident. On the Susitna one person has died
19 well above Devil Canyon.

20 MR. BEDARD: Yeah, on Vee Canyon.

21 MS. HESSION: So people can die in whitewater, they can
22 die on lakes, they can die on ponds. I don't think there's
23 any way to make the world totally safe. If there is reason
24 for private owners to be concerned about potentially being
25 held liable then maybe that needs to be addressed in State



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 law, and it would just be a factor for Devil Canyon and corporations
2 zoning land along that. It would be any place where, because
3 the need of corporations or other private owners want to
4 welcome tourism and visitation, therefore there are going to
5 be people on there. So that's perhaps something that needs
6 to be addressed and put before the State legislature.

7 MR. LOWENFELS: Well, we need to address in this position,
8 I think, your contention that the future use estimate, that there
9 is no future use estimate in here. And I would like to
10 hope -- I would like to feel that we would be able to come
11 to you and get that information from you to put into the
12 position paper. I think some of our efforts in the past may
13 not have been as smoothly handled as possible. We'd like
14 to open up that line of communication. I think we also have
15 to take a look at the question of Native impact. Now, we've
16 mentioned it here, and maybe what we need to do is footnote
17 it and indicate that there's a lot of questions about
18 whether this is something that, first of all, is permanent
19 given the fact that the Natives may very well decide if you
20 would indemnify them and pay a proper fee you could use the
21 river resources. So we need to address those things, and
22 we recognize those. I don't -- I'm not sure we'll gain
23 much more by continuing to discuss those issues. It would
24 be very helpful, for a number of reasons, if we could assume
25 for a couple of minutes that the dam that's proposed is going



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 to be licensed; the mitigation measures we've discussed in
2 here. I know it's heresy to put yourself in that mind set,
3 but the mitigation measures we've discussed in here are
4 very likely to be mitigation measures that would be adopted
5 as license conditions by the Federal regulatory commission
6 if, in fact, with regard to this particular issue -- if in
7 fact a dam is constructed. How do you feel about those
8 mitigation measures? Assume again, and we understand it's
9 just an assumption, et cetera, that the dams are going to be
10 built. Have we hit mitigation measures and minimization
11 measures properly, or are there other ones we should be
12 putting in here? Could we get some kind of reaction in
13 that regard?

14 MR. HARRISON: We have it. I would like to make another
15 comment in regards to this genocidal act of ANCSA in which
16 Mr. Allen referred that -- about my comment a minute ago.
17 If each and every one of you would have studied the Federal
18 regulation, the Federal acts, concerning aboriginal title
19 transfers, you would see why I'm saying this is a genocidal
20 act. In that act it says in 1971 there is no more Native
21 people born to the American people. That's bull crap.

22 MR. ALLEN: But we're all here, you know. We're going
23 to have to.....

24 MR. HARRISON: Well, Mr. Allen, this is.....

25 MR. ALLEN: We're here to talk about whitewater. We're



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 not here to talk about ANCSA or aboriginal rights. There
2 are plenty of forums for that discussion and.....

3 MR. HARRISON: That is the basis for this.

4 MR. ALLEN: No, it isn't.

5 MR. HARRISON: Yes, it is.

6 MR. ALLEN: The issue on the agenda.....

7 MR. HARRISON: The issue here is the Native population
8 in Alaska has the authority to tell you what you are going
9 to do with their lands. Mr. Allen, you know that as a
10 regional solicitor.

11 MR. ALLEN: I'm not running this meeting, but I came
12 here with the understanding we were going to talk about
13 whitewater.

14 MR. ARMINSKI: Dave, can we.....

15 MR. HARRISON: Well, I can see that this meeting is a
16 waste or everybody's time.

17 MR. ALLEN: You can find plenty of places to talk about
18 your concerns about ANCSA, but this is -- the people that
19 came to this meeting didn't come to hear you rant about
20 genocide.

21 MR. HARRISON: They're wasting their time, everyone in here.

22 MR. LOWENFELS: Okay. If you would assume for a couple
23 minutes that the dam is going to be built as suggested, the
24 two-dam configuration, what mitigation measures should we
25 be highlighting that we have not touched upon, and what is



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 your reaction to the ones we have touched upon?

2 MR. KORNBRATH: I'd like to see at least one more
3 mitigation measure added to that list, but I feel it's
4 important. And you know, as I see it, once that the dams go
5 you have access, public access, to some degree to whatever
6 arrangements. This is going to be a place that probably
7 people head for, tourists and some locals to take a look at
8 it or enjoy the scenery, boating, what have you. I think that
9 to me it would be very important to see the -- what I call
10 that stretch of river and especially the Devil's Canyon
11 stretch recorded for all time. I think it should be
12 photographed. I think movies of, possibly, boaters running
13 the rapids should be taken. I think slides, perhaps a
14 multi-image slide show. Something along those lines would
15 be worth having in your visitor's center.

16 MR. SUTTLE: I think that's a good point.

17 MR. RICHARDSON: Jack, you've got a list; don't you?

18 MR. HESSION: Yes. We have discussed this among
19 ourselves and feel that the mitigation measures as proposed
20 are totally inadequate and insufficient; and furthermore
21 that if both dams are built then for all practical purposes
22 the whitewater resource is lost. I don't think anyone
23 interested in that form of recreation would bother to put
24 in at any point along the river. However, if you were to
25 add some additional mitigation there might be some interest



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 in the Devil Canyon stretch, and that would involve a sort
2 of release schedule.

3 MR. ALLEN: You mean if only one dam were built?

4 MR. HESSION: No, assuming both dams.

5 MR. ALLEN: Both dams?

6 MR. HESSION: Below Devil Canyon, if there were a
7 release schedule such that the flow was sufficient for
8 whitewater boating at certain times during the summer months,
9 that would be one way of mitigating the loss. Another one
10 that's already been touched on is access. If access to the
11 dam sites, particularly the Susitna, the Devil Canyon dam,
12 if access was assured; you know, some way of camping there
13 overnight and primitive camping facilities, parking area
14 with the assurance that you could stay there. That's
15 another mitigation.

16 MS. ERNST: Is that so that you can run the stretch
17 below Devil Canyon?

18 MR. HESSION: Uh-huh. You'd have to have some way to
19 get down to the put-in and put in; get down to the river at
20 that point. Apparently, the steep canyon walls at that
21 point are such that it might be difficult. And I didn't
22 realize until this morning that the lower, the first mile-
23 and-a-half stretch, was going to be dewatered entirely.

24 MS. HESSION: Would a release be impossible?

25 MR. ARMINSKI: John, can you talk about the release



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 side.

2 MR. BIZER: Okay. During the summer, basic operation
3 of the reservoirs and so forth is to store the water for
4 release later on in the summer. Now, generally the way the
5 -- based on the record, historical record, that we do have
6 and imposing an operational regime on that, the reservoir
7 becomes filled to its maximum, or near maximum, capacity so
8 that they have sufficient water run through the winter. It fills
9 generally in the first of August to mid-August, that time
10 frame. Once that occurs, then flows in excess of what they
11 need for power would have to be released to maintain -- so
12 we don't get a surcharge in the reservoir. So that period-
13 ically, and depending on the low demand during the summer,
14 the power demand, there would be releases from either Watana,
15 when it's the Watana only situation, and then when Devil
16 Canyon comes on there would be releases from Devil Canyon
17 that would not be going through the powerhouse. So
18 basically between the end of July and the end of August and
19 middle of September, there would be flows, releases, from the
20 dams that would water that area. So that time frame you're
21 talking about.....

22 MR. HESSION:right at Devil Canyon dam so that
23 the last rapid would have water in it. It wouldn't be
24 rerouted and then put back in the river?

25 MR. BIZER: No. The release would be through the



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 release facilities.....

2 MR. ALLEN: In the dams.

3 MR. BIZER:in the dams themselves. In Devil
4 Canyon it would be the cone valves.

5 MR. ALLEN: Would it be -- we have a -- although
6 we're not absolutely sure of the levels. The people that
7 have run it feel that 13,000 is probably the minimum that,
8 at least, some of the rapids can safely be run at. How
9 feasible would it be to make your releases on a -- kind of
10 a uneven basis; release a large amount during the day and
11 then maybe shut it off during the night?

12 MR. BIZER: Okay. This is one of the things we have
13 to deal with in asking that kind of thing is the effects
14 on the fish populations which is an interreaction. It's
15 not an issue right now. But one of the things that we're
16 looking at in our flow regime that we consider on that is
17 the fluctuation and flow. In general terms, very general
18 terms, flow fluctuation to any extent is looked down upon
19 with respect to fish. We are talking about a time period
20 when the salmon are going to be spawning, and that's a
21 fairly critical time in the cycle of the fish. There has
22 been in the initial -- in the license application the flow
23 regime which is proposed there calls for a minimum of 12,000
24 cfs during this August, September time frame. That has been
25 revised now and we're currently looking at another flow



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 regime which maintains a minimum of 9,000 cfs through the
2 summer from the first of June through the middle of September.
3 Under both regimes, under either one of those, generally in
4 August the mean flows are going to be somewhat above that
5 simply because the reservoirs are full. I don't have with
6 me right now what the estimates of the flows are, but there
7 are times during the summer under any of these flow regimes
8 that the flows will be significantly greater than 13,000.
9 It could be up as high as 20,000 cfs. Okay? Another thing
10 that happens is that when Devil Canyon comes on line, you're
11 going to have a significant increase in the capacity of the
12 dams to produce power; and that's in just a short period
13 of time from what we're estimating, 2001 which is the last
14 year of Watana and 2002 is the first year of Devil Canyon.
15 You're going to have an increase of capacity of about 600
16 megawatts by putting that -- the dam on. As a result, you're
17 going to be able to generate more power with less flow, or
18 the same amount of flow. So the flows needed during the
19 winter are going to be considerably less to get the same
20 amount of power. The reservoirs won't be drawn down as far
21 -- or the Watana won't be drawn down as far, and as a result
22 you'll be able to fill it sooner in the summer and have to
23 release water to a larger extent during the latter part of
24 the summer. We're talking there in terms of flows in excess
25 of 15,000 cfs. Again, it depends upon whether it's a wet



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 year or a dry year or whatever, the supply of water. But
2 during those times when water is released from the dam, and
3 the most likely times are, in late July up to the middle of
4 September. At those times you're going to have flows in
5 your -- quite possibly in the level you're talking about, the
6 13,000 cfs or greater.

7 MR. ARMINSKI: Jack, you filed recently with FERCA a
8 submission that talks about the proposed flow regime. And
9 correct me if I'm wrong, but there's a printout on the back
10 of that thing that's three or four inches thick, and I think
11 it tells -- was it 33 or 34 years of record? -- what the
12 releases would be from the dams; and get some idea from that.

13 MR. THRALL: In getting back to what you were interested
14 in in terms of predictability, or some ability to predict
15 ahead of time when some of these releases will be, as John
16 indicated, the operation of the project will eventually
17 come to be some set of compromise between the environmental
18 needs, the need not to release some of these waters -- at
19 certain times of year you're going to get temperature effects
20 and you get water flow fluctuation effects -- to the need to
21 maintain your reservoir at a certain level. And basically,
22 a lot of these releases are made in response to storm
23 events in the basin. And there are ways of getting some
24 level of prediction so the people can hear about this. I
25 was involved, as John was, I think, in working with Corps of



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 Engineers on hooking a hydropower development on the Gauley
2 River. That's whitewater. You people may be familiar with
3 that. It's a very popular river with the dam already there.
4 We're looking at whitewater, and we found there that it
5 would be possible, for example, to give some additional
6 prediction. What happens is that -- what happened there at
7 the time we were looking at it is there would be a storm in
8 the basin and the Corps would call up a couple of whitewater
9 people and people would, literally, get in their cars and
10 drive for, you know, 24 hours straight to get there when they
11 knew the Corps would be releasing flows. You'd probably
12 have the same sort of a situation. You could get some sort
13 of prediction. But when the reservoir is rising and it's
14 getting to a certain critical point, they're going to release.
15 They're forced to release. When you have to worry about
16 predicting storm events and, you know, whether this range
17 is going to continue for another 24 hours or cut off, it
18 makes it -- the time you've got to make a prediction gets
19 cut back.

20 MS. HESSION: Yes, we are aware of the Gauley situation.
21 Several of us here have run it, and we were looking
22 specifically to that sort of situation when we recommended
23 back in '82 that the schedule be published far enough in
24 advance to allow people to come.

25 MR. THRALL: There's certainly that possibility. And



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 what would happen, I would imagine, is that that sort of a
2 release schedule would be established rather roughly at
3 first; and with experience, as the project experience grew,
4 and sitting down and probably negotiating some tradeoffs with
5 some of the fisheries people, you would refine that. Because
6 certainly in the Gauley situation, what we found was that
7 fisheries, and whitewater and rapids were very often in total
8 opposition for their needs. So you get into some real
9 tradeoffs there.

10 MS. ERNST: I'd like to mention in talking about
11 flows and looking at some of the documents for flow release
12 schedules, we need to remember that the flows that have been
13 published are for below the tailrace. So the flows that
14 you're concerned about are flows that will -- that will be
15 be discharged from what they call the fixed cone valves. And
16 those flows have been published, too, recently. I believe
17 now that they are quite a bit below the 13,000 cfs. That's
18 something that we can go back.....

19 MR. ALLEN: Well, we don't really know the 13 is the
20 critical level for that section of water. There's some of
21 the holes up above, I think -- isn't that right, Steve?

22 MR. KOSLOW: Yeah, the ledge drops that.....

23 MR. ALLEN: Hotel Rock, it's unrunable below that;
24 right?

25 MR. BIZER: That's the question I was going get follow-up



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3643

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 on a little bit as to whether the 13 seems reasonable for
2 that reach, or what kind of minimum flow do you think would
3 be necessary?

4 MR. ALLEN: Maybe much less is tolerable there. I
5 don't know the nature of those rapids. Do you, Rich?

6 MR. ARMINSKI: Does our aerial photography cover that
7 part of the river at the different flows?

8 UNIDENTIFIED: I believe it does.

9 MR. BIZER: It comes pretty close if it doesn't. I
10 know it goes up to Portage Creek, and it may -- I know some
11 of the aerial photography does go up above. And we do have
12 that photography at about -- when the flow in the river at
13 Gold Creek was about 20,000 cfs. But less than that, we've
14 got additional photography now ranging from 5,100 cfs all
15 the way up to 2,600 -- or 26,000 cfs. And right offhand,
16 I'm not sure how far up that goes. I know it goes at
17 least to Portage Creek, and it may go up to the dam site.
18 I'm not real sure on that.

19 MR. MARCHEGIANI: I have a question. I'm a little bit
20 confused. I don't whitewater at all myself. But you're
21 talking about a minimum flow of about 13,000. My impression
22 -- I'm a hydraulic engineer so to speak -- is that if you
23 have too much water in that river you're going to really
24 have a problem because of exactly what you're talking about,
25 the hydraulics are unique. If you have a lot of water going



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 down there you have a better chance of killing yourself.

2 MR. ALLEN: Not always. It depends on the configuration
3 of the rapid; and there are certain ledge drops that are
4 very much like a low dam where the water comes over them
5 without much turbulence but creates a backwash behind that
6 dam that's the killer. There's no way to fight your way
7 through that backwash and it just keeps recirculating you into
8 the waterfall.

9 MR. MARCHEGIANI: Can it generally be stated that more
10 water is better?

11 MR. ALLEN: No. It depends on the nature of the rapid.
12 In some configurations more water is safer, in others less.

13 MR. MARCHEGIANI: If you have a bracket that you feel
14 comfortable with, what is it?

15 MR. ALLEN: We don't know enough about that particular
16 section of the last rapid. There's some rapids further up
17 that people who have seen them say they are killers at less
18 than 13,000 feet. You get in a hole and if you were swimming
19 or even in your boat, you'd be unable to get out of it.

20 MR. MARCHEGIANI: Okay.

21 MR. ALLEN: Whereas more water washes the rapid out.
22 Sometimes the higher water just washes the whole thing out
23 and you just go on through.

24 MR. MARCHEGIANI: What you're really saying is there
25 are sections in the river where 13,000 would provide you



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 with the ability to get through it. If you went to 20,000
2 in some areas you might have difficulty getting through the
3 river?

4 MR. ALLEN: Well, most people that have run it have
5 run it between 15 and 26; and the feeling is that below 13
6 it's not safe to run, and above 35 it would also be a killer.

7 MR. SUTTLE: Would checking these air photos that Don
8 mentioned, at various flows, be helpful in helping you make
9 that type of determination?

10 MR. ALLEN: I frankly doubt it.

11 MR. KORNBRATH: I think I can address that. I've got
12 a set of air photos, pretty good quality, through there.
13 And when we were there it was really high water level. And
14 the lower stretch, which is the only thing we're concerned
15 with, the last set of rapids, you've got at least three
16 river-wide holes, that type of rapid. It's real similar to
17 the ledge rapids that are up at the head of the canyon at
18 Devil's Creek. It's a rapid that goes the width of the
19 river. There's no way around it; and it's just a drop like
20 a stair step. You've got at least three of those up there.
21 The rest of the turbulence in there is generally just big,
22 breaking waves and turbulence from waves bouncing off the
23 canyon walls. Probably the biggest problem with the flows
24 in that stretch of river would be if you make the flow so
25 low that you get a situation like Jack was talking about



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 where you potentially get trapped in these recirculating
2 eddies. With higher water that type of rapid would probably
3 be the type that would tend to wash out and be a little bit
4 easier. It would push you on through and you wouldn't get
5 stuck there. But the thing about access is that in order to
6 run that stretch of the rapids, you really have to access
7 the rapid, the canyon, real close to the base of the dam
8 because if you only have access three-quarters of a mile,
9 below the dam for whatever reason -- the walls are too steep
10 or the tailrace or whatever -- then there are no rapids to
11 run, no Class VI rapids.

12 MR. MARCHEGIANI: Do you know what year that photography
13 is that you have?

14 MR. KORNBRATH: I think it's '77. And some is colored
15 infrared and I've got black-and-white's, too.

16 MR. MARCHEGIANI: That just helps us.

17 MR. ARMINSKI: Jim, can we keep moving on through this?

18 MR. RICHARDSON: I just have one set of comments that
19 you can take out of context here, a hypothetical situation.
20 And again, if you suggest a hypothetical situation that the
21 dams are going to be built, I'd like to suggest one that
22 the Watana Dam gets built and the Devil's Canyon rapid is
23 going to be free-flowing after that dam is built. Don't
24 take that out of context. But if that situation should at
25 any time arise, these comments on the minimum flows are



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 important. And the fellow that was going to come this
2 morning and didn't make it, Chris Roach, has run the canyon
3 a couple times at different water levels. And yesterday we
4 discussed with him this type of ledge drop action at the
5 lower end, and he suggested that at water levels below 13
6 the Devil's Canyon rapid would be extremely dangerous. So
7 it needs more water, a higher water flow, so that it gets
8 enough push to make the configuration runnable. So now we
9 can switch back to the situation that we're talking about.

10 MR. THRALL: Just, I think, to reiterate, it would
11 certainly be helpful to us, any detailed information, more
12 detailed information you could provide on your estimates of
13 what would or wouldn't be appropriate flows at any stretch --
14 would certainly be of use.

15 MR. BEDARD: Could I throw in a quick question?

16 MR. ARMINSKI: Sure.

17 MR. BEDARD: Would you see that -- if the Natives were to
18 provide some kind of easement to APA right at the foothill
19 of the dam so that kayakers would have an area, say a one-
20 acre site, as a mitigation; is that something that, you
21 people, would be acceptable to? What would you need? I
22 hear you talking about you'd like to see some kind of access, but
23 you're not saying.....

24 MR. RICHARDSON: Kayakers and canoers -- I don't want
25 to -- we're talking kayakers because to this point in time



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 other types of crafts haven't negotiated the rapids
2 successfully, although a person tried it in a river boat.
3 But he was just trying to show us how to do it. Generally
4 in other rivers that we boat, canoers and kayakers have
5 fairly rudimentary needs. You need a path from someplace
6 that you could take a vehicle where you drive in, access.
7 You need a road, hopefully not too far to the edge of the
8 water. You need a place where if you're going to camp, a
9 primitive camping site; again, nothing fancy. And where
10 you're in a situation where you're leaving vehicles in a
11 road access situation and taking vehicles out, you sometimes
12 leave vehicles there. That is about all we look for. And
13 in running a river where you have multi-day trips, you need
14 areas to camp. Now frequently those are gravel bars in the
15 middle of the river, things like that.

16 MR. BEDARD: BLM has presently provided for that so-called
17 purpose. It was the one-acre site. But like I say, it's
18 way -- almost 40 miles away from Devil Canyon. It's closer
19 to Watana.

20 MR. RICHARDSON: Well, given the system that we're
21 talking about, a system where people are going to be putting
22 in below Devil Canyon and running from there, an access
23 site would be useful. Although personally, the way it
24 sounds the Devil's Canyon were built you wouldn't have many
25 customers because there's no water coming out of that dam.



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 If it were built and if people were going to run it, that's
2 the type of facilities that they would look for.

3 MR. KORNBATH: Yeah, basically you get boaters going
4 in there to, perhaps, put in and float down to Portage Creek
5 and do some fishing there and then continue on their way.

6 MR. RICHARDSON: Talkeetna or Gold Creek.

7 MS. ERNST: Can I just clarify then. If Devil Canyon
8 rapids are not runnable, you still are interested in these
9 kinds of facilities at Portage Creek; is that right? Near
10 Portage Creek?

11 MR. KORNBATH: Yes. The only nearest place to put in
12 if you don't do something like that would be Gold Creek at
13 the bridge which is a very -- quite a popular trip now.
14 Certainly not a wilderness trip, but it's a nice two or
15 three day trip; and there are side creeks that come in where,
16 you know, you can get some grayling fishing and trout fishing.
17 Side hikes, too. I don't know whose land it is.

18 MR. MARCHEGANI: Going back to your communication that
19 you were talking about photographing the canyon, looking at
20 boaters running down through it -- or kayaking down through
21 it. If we were to decide to go ahead and do something like
22 that, within the State of Alaska -- as I said, I'm not a
23 kayaker -- my understanding is, at least listening to this
24 room, there's not a whole lot of us that are going to go down
25 that river outside of one individual -- would we have a hard



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 time finding somebody to go down that river? Are we talking
2 about six people within the state? Are we going to have to
3 go out of the state and do whatever? Are we talking six,
4 10, 20?

5 MR. KOSLOW: We could get a team of six together,
6 probably, to run a trip for that to show you that -- to
7 document the fact that the river is unrunable. It wouldn't
8 be that difficult to get a group together, I don't think.

9 MR. KORNBRATH: If ABC sports can do it, I don't see
10 why we couldn't. Give these guys a chance to be on film,
11 they'll crawl out of the woodworks and they'll be there.

12 MR. KOSLOW: I'd say there's more than a dozen that
13 I can think of that live in Alaska that have the capabilities
14 of running that river, and under the right circumstances
15 would probably do it.

16 MR. ARMINSKI: In the interests of time, can we conclude
17 the discussion on this? I think it's 7:00 and we've got to
18 spend more time with you folks and get some more information.

19 MS. HESSION: Can I just clarify it in my own mind now:
20 When you were discussing potentially 9,000 cfs all summer
21 long or potentially, presumably, a lower low, and then as of
22 August 1st it would be going up to a higher rate, you were
23 meaning outflow right there at the Devil Canyon dam, and
24 therefore something -- No?

25 MR. THRALL: No, that's the outlet of the powerhouse.



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 The flows that come out of the outlet of the dam are release
2 flows that come through the fixed cone valve structures; and
3 those are made in response to basin storm events where
4 there's a need to release water from the reservoir. They
5 generally come in the fall of the year. They can occur
6 other times of the year as well. We have, and without going
7 back to the analysis that we've got -- what we've done is
8 taken the years -- some what, 32, John? Thirty-two years of
9 records?

10 MR. BIZER: Thirty-four years of records.

11 MR. THRALL: Thirty-four years of records, climate data,
12 and superimpose that on the reservoir system on the river,
13 superimpose the power operation of the project and everything,
14 and we can run a model that tell us, given that type of
15 climate scenario, when we do or don't have to release water
16 from the face of the dam. What we'll have to do to really
17 get a better response to you, or give you better feel for
18 what's possible, is to go back and look at that information.
19 But the 9,000 cfs that John was talking about is down where
20 the water that goes through the power terminal comes out;
21 right?

22 MR. BIZER: Well, it would probably be a combination
23 because.....

24 MR. THRALL: Well, yeah.

25 MR. BIZER: It'll be a combination. Part of that will



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3643

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 be for power generation. I don't know what the volume would
2 be required for the power generation at that time. It might
3 be on the order of 5 to 6,000 cfs. The remainder to make up
4 to that minimum flow of 9,000 will be released from the dam.
5 So that flow might be on the order of 3 to 4,000 cfs.

6 MR. THRALL: Again, but that's the minimum?

7 MR. BIZER: Yeah.

8 MR. THRALL: And on a year in, year out, we're not --
9 we don't ride along the minimum all the time?

10 MR. BIZER: Yeah.

11 MR. THRALL: We're above the minimum. It gets to be a
12 very complex thing which is why you have to go back and
13 look at our output.

14 MR. BIZER: Based on the 50 -- or 30 years or 34 years
15 of record in the operation, I think the median flow, 50
16 percent of the time or greater -- or if 50 percent of the
17 cases that we've looked at, if you impose these power demands
18 on the flows historically. Given those flows, at least 50
19 percent of the time you'd get flows in excess of maybe 12 to
20 13 to 14,000 cfs. Again, that depends really on the demand
21 for power, how much water is coming down the river from
22 earlier in the summer. If you get a real dry year like --
23 was it in 1969, I think was a real dry year. If the project
24 would have been in position during 1969, they would probably
25 have had trouble filling the reservoir. Okay? On the other



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3643

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 hand in, I think it was, 19 -- it was about the mid-fifties,
2 there was a period in there where the flow -- it was an
3 extremely wet period. And there were times when the flow
4 in the river under natural conditions were in excess of
5 70,000 cfs. And that, of course, would fill the reservoir
6 very rapidly and you'd get a lot more flow.

7 MR. ALLEN: I thought there was a 100,000 year one time
8 -- one year?

9 MR. BIZER: That's downstream further, yes. If you
10 get that at -- at Sunshine or the Parks Highway bridge down
11 at the mouth you get flows in excess of 10,000 at the mouth
12 almost annually. But I'm talking at Gold Creek.

13 MR. ALLEN: No, I thought there was a year at Gold
14 Creek where there was a flood; a 100 year flood had made
15 100,000 cfs.

16 MS. BERGMANN: Maybe in 1971 that was.

17 UNIDENTIFIED: Approximately 92,000.

18 MR. BIZER: Yeah. Okay.

19 UNIDENTIFIED: Not quite 100.

20 MS. ERNST: And so we want to make it clear then, that
21 these flows you're talking about, John, are downstream in
22 the rapid; right?

23 MR. BIZER: Pardon?

24 MS. ERNST: These flows that you're talking about are
25 downstream in the rapids?



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 MS. BERGMANN: Partly downstream, partly upstream.

2 MR. BIZER: Yes. Partly upstream.

3 MR. HESSION: If I can summarize this discussion with
4 respect to our basic interest in mitigation, it would be
5 that we would look towards a Gauley River model for releases
6 from Devil Canyon dam such that you could, perhaps, optimize
7 whitewater at the same time as protect fishery and other
8 values. I'm familiar with the detail with the Gauley River
9 situation, and also somewhat with the Akully River resolution.
10 And that just involves trying to figure out flows that can
11 satisfy different interests.

12 MR. BEDARD: I have just two things. Primarily page
13 7 and page 9. On page 7 in the bottom paragraph you mention
14 the trip to Stephan Lake will not be possible after the
15 project is completed unless the boaters traverse the Watana
16 Reservoir. When you are referring to boaters here, are you
17 including the kayakers and canoers and rafters?

18 MS. ERNST: Yes.

19 MR. BEDARD: The reason is, on the canyon walls, you
20 know, they submitted that they can portage there, I can't
21 see any reason why they can't portage others, the Watana
22 dam site. I guess the indication is saying they can't do
23 it, because they're.....

24 MR. ALLEN: What I think it means, is that you got to
25 float down the reservoir to get to the portage.



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3643

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 MR. BEDARD: No. Just when you come to the dam itself,
2 you portage around the dam, go back to foothill of the dam
3 and then go back on.

4 MS. HESSION: Assuming it's physically possible if
5 you're surrounded by.....

6 MR. BEDARD: Well, no. The Watana dam site on each
7 side is pretty flat area.

8 MS. ERNST: So the concerns -- assuming that you can get
9 out again, the concerns would be ownership, the Power Authority
10 who owns the land.

11 MR. BEDARD: Is that what this means? It's not
12 explained, you know, of -- back up of what you're trying to
13 say here?

14 MS. ERNST: I guess it's too.....

15 MR. BEDARD: If it's, again, access, it's something that
16 we're going to have to mitigate.

17 MS. HESSION: Bruce, hadn't you said that there was an
18 easement up to Stephan, up to the north end?

19 MR. BEDARD: Well, this is where these easements end
20 up. Back me up on that. The easements are only identified
21 at points, and the point they identified is sort of midway
22 between where the Watana dam is proposed and where the Devil
23 Canyon dam is proposed. It's a midway out point north and
24 south of the river, but only on each side in that particular
25 area, one-acre site; each one with a little trail going to



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 the public land. And the public lands, as far as going to
2 Stephan Lake, stops at Stephan Lake. That's where the ease-
3 ment stops.

4 MR. SUTTLE: I think maybe we can just restructure to
5 clarify this. Essentially it's saying that you won't be
6 able to have access to Stephan Lake unless you float down
7 the reservoir and portage down Watana Dam.

8 MR. BEDARD: I think that should be clarified. It
9 says here that it will be impossible, or not possible; and
10 I think it needs clarification that it is possible and can
11 be mitigated if it needs access or an additional easement or
12 whatever. But it should be addressed. The page 9 is roughly
13 the same thing. It's saying that because of the access to
14 project lands will be restricted, and exiting the steep
15 river bluffs prior to the Watana dam site may be difficult
16 for boaters. Again, now at Watana, that's easy to exit
17 right now; and even with the dam in place, in fact, it will
18 be even easier. But again, this is something that I would
19 have to bring back to the Native leaders and it is something
20 that they would like to have. I would like to know it so I
21 can bring it back to the people I represent. If you want us
22 to provide boating access and one-acre sites, I can address
23 this in our recreational plans as our part of the mitigation
24 we're trying to do here.

25 MR. KORNBATH: Once the dams are built, you're looking



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 at a different type of boater than the free flowing-type
2 boaters that, you know, are up here.

3 MR. BEDARD: There still might be the rafter that would
4 come down the Denali Highway to the Watana dam and then
5 portage below the dam and then come off at Stephan Lake to
6 go down Prairie Creek.

7 MR. ALLEN: Yeah, I think there will be some of those,
8 and I think it's safe to say that those kinds of access
9 easements that you're talking about would be very welcome
10 to those boaters.

11 MR. BEDARD: Yeah, 'cause the access easements which
12 we argued with BLM to try to accommodate those easements,
13 belong with what the, you know -- the project was sinking
14 and at the time BLM said: No, this is how we're going to do
15 it. And we were stuck with those easements as they're
16 designed now even though we didn't agree with them.

17 MR. ALLEN: They don't make much sense.

18 MR. BEDARD: Well, that's what I tried to tell BLM at
19 the time of negotiating these was that -- I said: Look, the
20 project is going to go here and here and it makes sense to
21 put these easements at these locations.

22 MR. LOWENFELS: Well, we know it wasn't a stubborn
23 solicitor.

24 MR. BEDARD: At the time -- but I don't want to down-
25 grade BLM, but that was just one of the problems we had.



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 MS. ERNST: I'd like to summarize the additional
2 mitigation measures that were proposed. One was recording
3 the Devil Canyon rapids through film. First was recording
4 the use of the Devil Canyon rapids through film or multi-media
5 and installing that in the visitor's center. Publishing
6 release schedules was mentioned. And I'd like to clarify that
7 below Portage Creek -- or the release schedules that have
8 been published in terms of median flows and low flows, and
9 as far as the portion of the Susitna River between the dam
10 and Portage Creek, those flows again have been published.
11 And access to Devil Canyon dam, or to the remaining portion
12 of the rapids, was proposed. And we'll have to go back and
13 see if that's possible to run that portion of the river. I
14 think that's all.

15 MR. LOWENFELS: Susan, can you find out who among the
16 KKK we should be sending the flows that have been published?
17 There are so many things that are published that you're
18 probably getting as intervenors, it would be easier perhaps
19 if we identified some of this information and sent a
20 separate packet to you?

21 MR. HESSION: Yes.

22 MR. LOWENFELS: Should that go to Jim or.....

23 MR. RICHARDSON: It should go to the president of the
24 club. The current president is Mike Grijalva, G-r-i-j-a-l-v-a.

25 * * * * *



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 The address is Post Office Box 101935, Anchorage, 99510.

2 Okay? How is the information that we get, the regular
3 intervenor mail, addressed?

4 MS. HESSION: Well, none of it would have Mike's
5 name on it, so you know, we'll be able to tell. We all open
6 the mail, anyhow. However, we'll be looking especially for
7 that.

8 MR. SUTTLE: I think that's the point. We want
9 certain things with respect to use, flow information that we
10 need to get back to you, and get your information, and us
11 give you information; and the contact point should be Mike.

12 MS. HESSION: Yeah, if you just put his name on it.
13 That is the regular Knik Kanoers post office box, the address
14 you were just given.

15 MR. ARMINSKI: Okay. One last thing -- I think we'll
16 break here -- that I didn't mention earlier. We've got a
17 matrix on the back wall on the easel there. And basically
18 it's got all the issues I want to access and all the parties
19 that we deal with on the other access; and it's sort of a
20 score card for us to know where we're at. And we'd like
21 someone from your organization to say what your position is
22 on this position, whether it's -- I suspect your position is
23 as yet unresolved. And just note that so that we can keep
24 track of where we are with everyone on these things. It's
25 not a commitment. You can come back and erase your name



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 next week and change whatever. That's all. Thanks a lot
2 for coming.

3 MR. HESSION: Well, I for one want to say thank you.

4 (Break)

5 MR. ARMINSKI: To keep things confused, I think we'll
6 address the monitoring plans first and see how -- I think
7 those are going to be the most time consuming here. Why
8 don't we start with F-12, fisheries monitoring?

9 MR. THRALL: Tom, we're sending out for our fisheries
10 monitoring person.

11 MR. ARMINSKI: Oh, okay. Is he bringing donuts?

12 MR. THRALL: I think he might have gone downstairs.
13 I think he might have looked at the agenda and decided he
14 might go downstairs for a minute.

15 MR. ROSENBERG: I had a question which we might get
16 right off the bat.

17 MR. ARMINSKI: Okay.

18 MR. ROSENBERG: F-4. It's the procedural thing again
19 of the relationship between this monitoring plan and the
20 fish mitigation plan which is going to be backed up by a
21 monitoring plan. Is that what this is? Is this sort of the
22 initial discussion on how that is going to procedure-wise....

23 MR. ARMINSKI: Yeah, I think that would be fair to say.
24 Are you it, for monitoring? Okay. Basically, our position
25 is that we propose to formulate and implement a monitoring



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 plan. The goal of that is to ascertain the efficacy of our
2 mitigation measures and suggest -- help us to develop any
3 other mitigation measures that would be required. Larry?

4 MR. GILBERTSON: Basically what we did was looked at the
5 information that we've accumulated on the Susitna and its
6 resources. We looked at the issues of concern to the agencies,
7 reviewed the mitigation proposals that were already put forth,
8 and came up with a general group of subjects -- or parameters
9 to measure that we thought would have the greatest utility in
10 monitoring the efficiency of the overall mitigation; in
11 other words, maintaining production in the system; other
12 monitoring efforts to follow the success of particular
13 mitigation measures and then, also, just looking at some
14 other environmental parameters that would give us information
15 on the general quality of the environment. And those are
16 the things that are included in this general list of subjects
17 for monitoring.

18 MR. ARMINSKI: Any discussion?

19 MR. ROSENBERG: Yes. I have to get organized though.

20 MR. ARMINSKI: Okay.

21 MR. LATTA: Turn your name tag so that she can see it.

22 MR. ROSENBERG: I'm Dan Rosenberg. I know on table 1,
23 if I can find it, if I have the right paper.

24 MR. LATTA: Next.

25 MR. ROSENBERG: Table 1 is on page -- it follows page 7.



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 There is not much in the way of monitoring for dissolved
2 gas supersaturation. And in view of the last meeting
3 and that, I also question why, say, temperature and ice
4 turbidity and sediment wasn't monitored -- is not being
5 monitored in '86 and '87. I guess that's why my comment is.
6 It's a question of why we're not monitoring for dissolved
7 gas supersaturation beyond 1985 and why we're not monitoring
8 for temperature, ice turbidity and sediment in '86 and '87.
9 It seems that those are important to get good baseline
10 information on, that might affect the future monitoring once
11 the dams are in place.

12 MR. GILBERTSON: Okay. Both of those -- excuse. The
13 case of the supersaturation, we already have at least two
14 years of information. I think we might have three, I'm
15 not sure; but two or three years of information, anyway.
16 And our feeling is that with another year of information
17 that we'd have enough to establish the base line condition.
18 It's a flow related thing, the supersaturation. So our
19 feeling is that once you have enough data points to cover a
20 range of flows that would be -- that we would have under
21 natural, and with project, conditions then you can establish
22 the relationship between flow and supersaturation; and you
23 wouldn't need to monitor any more pre-project. Now, I
24 would say that at the end of the 1985 field season if we
25 determine that in fact we have not covered an important range



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 of flows and we do not have that relationship wired down,
2 then there would be an obvious need to measure it again in
3 the next field season. But there is just a -- we felt that
4 one more year would be sufficient to give us that base line.

5 MR. ROSENBERG: Yeah, there's a lot of -- or is there
6 a lot of variability in there that would make it advantageous
7 to have a longer term monitoring, and is the cost that much?
8 Perhaps there's more to be gained from it. All right. I
9 think that's what you're saying is that you will proceed
10 with it. And that should be written in here that you will
11 go ahead with it if you don't feel that the information up
12 to that point is sufficient.

13 MR. GILBERTSON: Okay. We'll have a report coming out --
14 I apologize, I don't remember if it's late this fiscal year
15 or next fiscal year -- that will summarize the gas -- is it
16 next year?

17 MR. MARCHEGIANI: I'm not sure.

18 MR. GILBERTSON: I can't remember. Anyway, it will
19 summarize the information we do have already on the super-
20 saturation in a single document. So everybody will get a
21 clear idea of what the variation is and what our needs
22 would be to set up the base line. On the temperature in ice,
23 again, that's a condition that we feel we do have a lot of
24 natural condition data on. We have three, four years of
25 observation on the ice processes; and you know, we're not



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 | sure what else -- what more -- what we would gain by
2 | continuing that on a yearly basis, but we're open to
3 | suggestion.

4 | MR. ROSENBERG: My only suggestion is that there is more
5 | to be gained than lost when the system is as variable as
6 | it may be. We're talking about once these dams are in
7 | place, the monitoring plan, they go on for a long period of
8 | time. The better base line information, the better conclu-
9 | sions can be drawn from the monitoring plan post-project.

10 | MR. ARMINSKI: I guess there's a point of diminishing
11 | returns.

12 | MR. ROSENBERG: Yeah, I'm sure that there is.

13 | MR. ARMINSKI: You know, we come under fire about the
14 | money we've spent already and, you know, if we can in good
15 | conscience -- I mean, I guess as scientists we all think:
16 | Boy, it would be nice to have a little more data. But you
17 | know, you've got to recognize that there is a cost benefit
18 | ratio.

19 | MR. MARCHEGIANI: The bottom line is that we've
20 | collected -- what is it? -- three years of temperature
21 | information. We've spent a fair amount of effort in looking
22 | at ice modeling, the state of the art, the best thing we can
23 | do. We've reinforced with a number of years of actual
24 | ice observations, calibrations of those models. We've done
25 | everything that we feel is physically possible within that



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3643

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 system to try to predict what might happen, observe what its
2 existing situation is, and we just don't see -- I mean, we
3 could continue to monitor it like next year, let's say; the
4 following year we monitor it. What does that mean? Again,
5 that's one more piece and how does that change what we saw
6 the year before? Well, it's about the same.

7 MR. ROSENBERG: We don't know that, Eric.

8 MR. MARCHEGIANI: Pardon?

9 MR. ROSENBERG: Do we know that?

10 MR. MARCHEGIANI: Oh, no, I don't know what it's going
11 to be next year, but what I'm saying is: How is it going to
12 differentiate -- how is it going to improve our ability to
13 do anything? What we've tried to do is take that information
14 and use it to calibrate the models given the information
15 that we have so that we could basically extrapolate. We've
16 done that. We feel that we've done the very best that we
17 can as far as providing information in that area. To go a
18 step further and spend additional money, we just don't feel
19 that it's reasonable.

20 MR. ROSENBERG: Okay. I guess my only answer to your
21 question is: How do we know, is that post-project is when
22 we'll find out.

23 MR. MARCHEGIANI: That's correct.

24 MR. ROSENBERG: When it's too late to do anything about
25 it, that's when we'll find out how effective this one was.



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 MR. ARMINSKI: Well, two more years may not, and so
2 on.

3 MR. ROSENBERG: No, I agree two more years may not.
4 Two more years may not cost much either, and it may cost a
5 significant amount more in the future.

6 MR. MARCHEGIANI: If you can tell us what we're going
7 to gain.

8 MR. ROSENBERG: No, I can't.

9 MR. MARCHEGIANI: Well, that makes it very difficult for
10 us to try to address what you want. What you're saying is
11 you want us to address looking at additional studies, but
12 yet there's.....

13 MR. ROSENBERG: These are not. These are just
14 continuations of these monitoring programs. We're not
15 talking about initiating new studies.

16 MR. THRALL: Dan, you're talking about the gas and
17 turbidity and all of those things that you mentioned
18 originally; right?

19 MR. ROSENBERG: Gas and turbidity and temperature, ice.

20 MR. THRALL: Maybe when you -- when water quality
21 sampling programs are established, sort of the way you do
22 it -- one way you do it, is you go out and you sample for
23 lots and lots of things initially, and you watch the
24 variability, you observe the variability over time. And
25 where you see very little variability, then you start to



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 cut back on the frequency of measuring those particular
2 parameters, and other things that are varying you continue.
3 Maybe what we need to do is go through a little exercise on
4 the variability of those data and come back to you and
5 discuss what we think that indicates in terms of needs for
6 monitoring.

7 MR. ROSENBERG: Yeah, well, I think that's what Larry
8 was implying, or saying.

9 MR. THRALL: So we'll go back and look at our data,
10 look at our various -- come up with an analysis and discuss
11 it with you. Would that be.....

12 MR. ROSENBERG: Sure.

13 MR. ARMINSKI: Other comments? Hank.

14 MR. HOSKING: I'd like to discuss resident species for
15 a moment. On the fish mitigation plan with the flows
16 proposed and so forth, it was sort of a selling fact that
17 the side slough habitat modifications would benefit resident
18 species. And here on page 14 the statement is made: No
19 specific monitoring studies are proposed for resident species.
20 And I would like to suggest that standard catch techniques
21 and results per unit of effort be included with the salmon
22 monitoring, and so forth; and then keep track of resident
23 species by this standard unit of effort each year as you
24 go along so in fact we do have some indication of the
25 benefits or lack of benefits on side slough habitat



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 modification. We do want to know that part.

2 MR. GILBERTSON: Right. It'll make your day.

3 MR. HOSKING: You're going to have to give us all the
4 concessions before you're through.

5 MR. GILBERTSON: At the time that we wrote this
6 position paper, our feeling was that by monitoring the
7 production of species fluctuation like salmon and Coho salmon
8 we would cover resident species, because their use of the
9 critical habitats are similar in time and space. Since that
10 time we've decided that, well, maybe it's not that good; and
11 so we have initiated a resident species monitoring program
12 that will begin next year. And it follows kind of what
13 you're suggesting, a catch per effort. Now in that scheme
14 we're focusing on rainbow trout in the Middle River. We
15 chose that one because it is -- its use of the mainstem
16 and critical habitats is so similar to Arctic grayling and
17 dolly varden that we felt that by focusing on that one we
18 could cover those other species.

19 MR. HOSKING: Would that be included in the revision
20 of this particular paper?

21 MR. GILBERTSON: Right. We'd include it in this
22 revision.

23 MR. HOSKING: Okay.

24 MR. GILBERTSON: One point -- one thing that we're
25 struggling with -- and if any of the agencies want to give



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3643

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 us some hints, we are concerned a little bit about how we
2 factor in the impacts of increased use of the resource up
3 there, non-project related increase in harvest. By simply
4 monitoring with a catch reference type model on the resident
5 species, all we would be able to detect is a change in the
6 abundance of that species. It would not tell us why the
7 abundance changed, if it was changed.

8 MR. HOSKING: Yeah. I have no idea. Fish and Game,
9 for example, would be doing creel census work; or anything
10 like that, I don't know.

11 MR. GILBERTSON: They don't -- I don't believe they do
12 that work in the Middle River area. They do it in some of
13 the tributaries.

14 MR. HOSKING: On page -- pardon me? On page 18 the
15 last sentence in the first two paragraphs reads similar:
16 Appropriate remedial action will be performed. And one is
17 to maintain slough productivity. The other refers to the
18 size of fish runs. I think we need some explanation of
19 what appropriate remedial actions are.

20 MR. GILBERTSON: Well, let's start with one that I think
21 is the easy one first. If the abundance of fish returning
22 to these -- I mean, if we modify these sloughs and do what
23 we hope they're going to do, we're going to create some
24 great spawning habitat. One of the problems that you
25 management people have to face when you do something like



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 that is over-escapement to those areas. If you get into
2 that situation -- it really -- I'm hesitating a little bit
3 because this really gets into a management decision. But
4 what we mean by remedial actions here is there are things
5 that you can do to limit the number of spawners that would
6 enter those areas if everybody agreed that that was a thing
7 that they wanted to do.

8 MR. HOSKING: Okay. My point -- I realize that there
9 are many options, but my point is in terms of this paper
10 right here. I think that you should be including some of
11 these in here. And if you feel that they are all management
12 decisions I think that should be so stated.

13 MR. GILBERTSON: Okay. It's not -- all right. Sure.

14 MR. HOSKING: Along those lines.

15 MR. GILBERTSON: Okay. On the other side, if they are
16 too low then we would go back with agencies and talk about
17 other options available.

18 MR. HOSKING: Okay. Fine. I think that should be
19 included in here; that's all.

20 MR. GILBERTSON: Okay.

21 MR. LOWENFELS: I think the point -- and maybe I'm
22 reading between the lines -- but you've got a basic check
23 list that you've got to go through to make sure that we've
24 considered everything. And unless we list those things,
25 you can't tell.



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 MR. HOSKING: That's true.

2 MR. LOWENFELS: So we've got to do that for record
3 purposes, if not just to explain to you what we are
4 considering.

5 MR. HOSKING: Right. I like to think that appropriate
6 remedial action is to build a \$30,000,000 fish hatchery out
7 there; and maybe the Power Authority thinks that an incubation
8 box for \$4,000 is appropriate. So who is to know what we're
9 talking about?

10 MR. ARMINSKI: Brad?

11 MR. SMITH: Well, are we looking at this issue paper
12 as more or less an agreement to agree, or should it, or
13 later iterations of this paper, establish monitoring goals
14 like the number of fish that we expect -- that we consider
15 to be the base line condition for evaluation purposes? And
16 how are we going to get to that point? And the second
17 question I had has to do with: We've mentioned earlier,
18 we've talked about the formation of an inter-agency team to
19 evaluate the results of the monitoring efforts and maybe
20 recommend any changes with the mitigative structures or
21 alternatives, or possibly revise how we're going to monitor
22 or what we're going to monitor for. I think we have to look
23 a little at that; and particularly if the inter-agency team
24 isn't established, how the contact and coordination is going
25 to occur, how issues are going to be resolved that come up,



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 and what status or what standing the agencies will have at
2 that point given that the license will have been issued.

3 MR. GILBERTSON: In answer to your first question,
4 what I'm looking for in this document in terms of agreement
5 or disagreement is, in a general sense, have we covered the
6 major components that ought to go in the long-term monitoring
7 plan? I'm just talking about the long-term. I'm not talking
8 about construction. The details of the monitoring plan, we
9 are looking forward to covering that in the arena of these
10 technical meetings that we've had; more technical level
11 meetings like the one we'll have next week. And what we want
12 to do in those is go through some of the actual details
13 about how we will measure production of the various species
14 in the system and some criteria for judgment; get into a
15 little bit of the statistics of monitoring. Is that what
16 you were.....

17 MR. SMITH: Yeah. It's kind of a similar situation with
18 temperatures, I guess, trying to resolve what temperatures
19 we'd like to see released for fisheries purposes; that type
20 of refinement. In both instances, it's not clear to me
21 though whether eventually, you know, we're going to hold
22 off on final approval of this until that series of technical
23 meetings and discussions have occurred, and we can slap it
24 back into this issue paper, and then put that package into
25 FERC for final license conditions; or whether it's going to



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 remain open with just a commitment from both agencies to
2 develop these.

3 MR. MARCHEGIANI: Are you looking for, Brad, you know
4 when we have those technical meetings and whatnot, we'll
5 discuss details and whatnot -- one of the things that may
6 make us feel a little bit better is, specifically -- or give
7 us better directions, is what details you are actually
8 looking for. The other thing is: Are you looking for those
9 details to be included in this paper?

10 MR. SMITH: That's what I'm asking.

11 MR. ARMINSKI: You know, I think there's going to be
12 a number of papers that just, you know, discuss issues that
13 you can't put the depth in the paper that's going to be
14 required, you know, for the satisfaction of license
15 conditions. And you know, as far as the monitoring plan,
16 it's never going to be the paper. I think we're going to
17 have to -- well, I know we're going to put together a
18 specific monitoring plan; and that's something that we're
19 all going to agree to. And it's not going to be this
20 paper, it's going to be that plan.

21 MR. LOWENFELS: What the paper does though, is sets
22 out, in this particular instance, a generalized position.
23 And I guess what we're looking back from you in this parti-
24 cular instance is some sort of an indication that our thrust
25 and our position is correct. And what I'm hearing now is,



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 first of all, we need a more detail. And I guess this is
2 one of those papers where we need to really address with you
3 what we expect to happen afterwards -- some of the discussion
4 further on down on this list -- before it makes sense to you
5 whether it's an acceptable document to you.

6 MR. SMITH: Sure. I think the points brought out here
7 in the paper that it's unreasonable to develop a final plan
8 at this point, that the nature of the beast is that you're
9 going to get changes occurring daily that you have to
10 react to and it has to remain flexible. What I'm asking for
11 right now is a little more detail about how the agencies
12 are going to be involved in those decisions, how the process
13 goes past the resolution of this particular issue. And it
14 sounds like this is a kind of a general agreement. That's
15 fine, but I don't know once this is signed off what.....

16 MR. ARMINSKI: Well, I guess one of the things we could
17 do in this paper is outline how we get from here, this
18 general paper, to the specific agreement on the monitoring
19 plan.

20 MR. LOWENFELS: For example, this happens to be one
21 of those items that there is a standard language used by
22 the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for a licensing
23 condition on post-construction monitoring. It's three
24 paragraphs long. Now, that's all FERC requires. And as I
25 recollect, it appoints a three-person team which studies the



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3643

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 system. The last one I saw was a 10-year study period;
2 10-year monitoring period. Now, that's not acceptable
3 either, but that's what FERC accepts. I don't think that's
4 what you want to live with, and that's too open-ended for
5 the APA to live with. So what you'd want is a stipulation
6 in the license that adopts a monitoring plan that we
7 jointly agree to.

8 MR. SMITH: Sure.

9 MR. LOWENFELS: And that plan would be developed more
10 or less through technical discussions between the staffs
11 of the APA and the agencies.

12 MR. SMITH: And that would end in what, a memorandum of
13 agreement or something?

14 MR. LOWENFELS: No, I think that would end in an actual
15 plan that would be acceptable.

16 MR. MARCHEGIANI: Similar to your better practices
17 manual?

18 MR. LOWENFELS: Yeah, maybe a little tighter.

19 MR. SMITH: And submitted to FERC for specific license
20 conditions.

21 MR. LOWENFELS: Right. Or in FERC's standard license
22 condition have that referenced as the base document.

23 MR. SMITH: Okay. You don't think that that level of
24

* * * * *

* * * * *



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 detail is appropriate or necessary for this settlement
2 issue?

3 MR. LOWENFELS: No. I mean it's part of the issue, but
4 I don't think it's appropriate for this document.

5 MR. SMITH: Okay.

6 MR. THRALL: When you initially brought this up, I
7 thought I heard you asking about -- what I was hearing you
8 say is you were kind of telling us, or starting to tell us,
9 what you saw as some of the things that would have to go
10 into a settlement instrument; and not just describe what
11 the monitoring plan is, but at some point how, you know, the
12 results of that monitoring plan are going to be evaluated
13 and how some changes are going to be implemented.

14 MR. SMITH: Somewhere we have to establish that.

15 MR. THRALL: And I guess what my understanding is that
16 that will evolve as part of the settlement of this issue,
17 and it's down there on the agreement of the type of the
18 settlement instrument and action plan to resolve the issue,
19 and it'll be some sort of a condition of it. The question,
20 for example, of how you measure, you know, impacts. Where
21 do you worry about annual fluctuations of populations. I
22 just want to -- I'm trying to clarify in my mind. Is that
23 what you were really driving at originally?

24 MR. SMITH: Yeah, it is. And do you feel like that's
25 described or brought out in the paper?



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 MR. THRALL: It probably isn't and I think it's.....

2 MR. LOWENFELS: The revision will have it. I mean I think
3 we'll just have to include it. Well, let me back up a second.
4 What I hear from you is that missing from this paper is a
5 better discussion of how the monitoring program is going to
6 relate -- how it's going to operate and how discoveries made
7 as a result of the monitoring program are going to be
8 translated into changes.....

9 MR. THRALL: Changes in mitigation.....

10 MR. LOWENFELS:changes in operation or mitigation
11 or maintenance or whatever.

12 MR. THRALL: Sure.

13 MR. SMITH: And how issues would be resolved among
14 the agencies and such, you know; and what standing we would
15 have in that process.

16 MR. LOWENFELS: Just talking out loud, doing our
17 homework out loud for a second, I think what that may
18 require is sort of an inclusion of the FERC process post-
19 license; a discussion of that and a recognition of that
20 so that we all know what will happen.

21 MR. SMITH: Uh-huh.

22 MR. ROBINSON: May I make a point here that might help
23 shed some light? FERC has its license articles, as we're
24 discussed, Brad, some of which are standard as Jeff has
25 pointed out. I think as Tom has pointed out, we'd all be



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 better off if -- the more specific the better. And if we
2 can something, a document that lays all these things out,
3 that everyone's already agreed to, why it will sail right
4 through and be a good idea. One of the things that can
5 happen, based on my past experience: If you don't, if you
6 use the general language in some of the FERC articles they
7 say some things like in consultation with the appropriate
8 agencies, and then it lists them. The applicant has to
9 study such and such a resource for x number of years, write
10 a report and then go back and talk to these agencies. And
11 then there's another part, as I recall, that says something
12 like if there's still a problem and it can't be resolved
13 amicably, then it gets thrown back into the FERC arena again.
14 And so it's carrying it one step on farther. What we're
15 trying to do here, avoiding that sort of thing, right up
16 front it would also help for the rundown of the process.
17 We've got a plan that we can all agree to and work out
18 together. And the details -- I think that there seems to
19 be some general agreement here that the details of such a
20 plan would come largely from some of the technical meetings
21 that Larry was talking about. And so it seems to me that
22 a lot of this could be encompassed in, what sounds like,
23 one collection of documents or one single document that
24 would respond to your concerns.

25 MR. SMITH: Yeah. And get as much of this done for



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 incorporation into the license as possible. We're very
2 leery about having FERC be an arbitrator or make decisions
3 about post-license changes.

4 MR. LOWENFELS: Well, the appointing of the biologist,
5 for example; there's no reason why we can't come up with
6 three names of respected individuals or five or 10. I mean,
7 we can be as specific as we can get in this and then present
8 that to FERC. I think that's what we'd want to do, not.....

9 MR. SMITH: Oh, yeah, there's likely possibilities
10 there.

11 MR. LOWENFELS: I feel very uncomfortable about
12 allowing a FERC Administrative Law Judge to tell this group,
13 you know, who should be on that monitoring team.

14 MR. SMITH: Yeah.

15 MR. LOWENFELS: I don't think it matters to the APA
16 who's on that monitoring team, but it certainly matters, I
17 think, to the fisheries biologists. We're going to work
18 with whoever is appointed. You people are going to appoint
19 the experts in the area, you know, not somebody that just
20 happens to teach in the University in Washington D.C. or
21 something of that sort known by an Administrative Law Judge.
22 So I think we'll end up with a detailed monitoring plan with
23 as much detail as even who's going to be on the plan, how
24 often they're going to meet, the base line data that they're
25 going to work from, the types of data that they're going to



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3643

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 collect, where they're going to keep it; all that kind of
2 stuff. And if you'd like to start working on it right now
3 and kind of hand us something.....

4 MR. SMITH: Sure. Maybe this paper could establish a
5 time when these series of technical meetings are supposed
6 to start up or something so we can compare that to when,
7 like Dan pointed out -- when the availability of that mitigation
8 plan is going to be, and see if it all makes sense.

9 MR. LOWENFELS: Let me ask this: Is there a particular
10 monitoring plan or model of a plan or an actual plan that is
11 in effect as a result of some other construction project in
12 the country that you people are aware of? I'm speaking out
13 of turn. I don't know whether there's a whole package of
14 these things, but if you know of something that should be a
15 model that we should be looking at, get it to us.

16 MR. SMITH: I'd be interested, too, and I am checking
17 that. Terror has got the only thing and there is some
18 fisheries work going on with Terror, but I'm not aware of
19 anything on this scale.

20 MR. LOWENFELS: And of course, it doesn't necessarily
21 -- it could be a Canadian monitoring plan. It doesn't have
22 to be an existing FERC project by any means.

23 MR. LATTA: It could be a Russian one.

24 MR. LOWENFELS: It could be a Russian one.

25 MR. HOSKING: I would like to see discussed in one of



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 these technical meetings the APA's projected monitoring plan
2 with the use of the Environmental Field Officer position;
3 and we should have all the agencies involved right there.
4 I commend APA for this approach. I think it's a good one.
5 However, I do remain skeptical of having quality assurance
6 and quality control on the same payroll. I think you're
7 saying there we need to discuss with the agencies how we can
8 get over this bit of skepticism and be assured we'll all be
9 getting the same information on the current planning.

10 MR. THRALL: Hank, could I say something about this?

11 MR. HOSKING: Sure.

12 MR. THRALL: Right now, because this is something that
13 I'm kind of interested in, and have been involved in some of
14 the thinking that went into this Environmental Field Officer.
15 I think it's very important for people to realize what sort
16 of philosophy has gone into thinking about the Environmental
17 Field Officer. I don't know if you were involved in some
18 meetings, oh, half a year ago or so where there was discussion
19 of best practices manuals and how those were going to be
20 developed, where Charlie Craddock talked about, you know, the
21 contract development -- development of contract documents
22 for the contractor and so on? Did you attend?

23 MR. HOSKING: I don't know if I was there or not. I
24 don't think so. It was August?

25

* * * * *



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3643

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 MR. THRALL: Yeah. Well, basically the thinking that
2 goes into this in appointing an Environmental Field -- having
3 the Power Authority appoint an Environment Field Officer
4 and then giving him some sort of instructions to go out
5 there and sort of protect the environment, you know, it's
6 sort of a vague charge. It's not what we're talking about
7 at all. What we're talking about in this is part of our
8 overall process that when the contract documents for this
9 job are put together, they will specify -- and you as an
10 agency will be involved in seeing what they specify -- they
11 specify certain things that the contractors have to do,
12 environmental conditions they have to comply with. And that
13 will be a -- the Environmental Field Officer's job will be
14 to enforce that. He's going to have something very specific
15 to enforce, and he's going to have a contract to work with.
16 This is the basic philosophy. And our feeling is that we
17 approach it in this way. You avoid, first of all, that
18 conflict of interest thing. It's just like the Power
19 Authority will have other -- they have engineers out there
20 who are -- their job is to make sure when that contractor
21 places fill it's the right quality of material, it's
22 compacted in the right way, you know, and put in at the right
23 place. And if they don't do it that way, there's no problem
24 of a contract dispute, the contractor just has to do it over
25 and do it right, and it's his loss. And our thought is that



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 Environmental Field Officer should have that same level of
2 authority and clearly defined role, that he has contract
3 documents that clearly state.....

4 MR. HOSKING: I appreciate the intent. I agree it
5 looks very good on paper. Too many times I've been in the
6 situation where the environment concerns, because of the
7 schedule crunch or something like this, were overruled by
8 a construction manager or something like this that happens
9 on a day-to-day basis.

10 MR. THRALL: The thought is that the Environment Field
11 Officer is going to have the same authority.....

12 MR. HOSKING: I know what the thought is.

13 MR. THRALL:as any engineer who inspects it.

14 And the thing is -- I guess the reason we see this as being
15 the way to go is that it's not -- it doesn't become a
16 nebulous thing. It's not that the contractor, when he
17 entered into this job and signed the contract, didn't know --
18 or can make the case that he wasn't aware he had to do these
19 things; and he can't make -- So then when, you know -- it's
20 not a case of him having any leeway to say: I've got a
21 claim here; it's going to cost you more money. It's his --
22 it comes out of his hide.

23 MR. HOSKING: Okay. Now, let's.....

24 MR. THRALL: That's the intent anyhow.

25 MR. HOSKING: These sort of things should be discussed



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 at a technical meeting, I think.

2 MR. THRALL: Right.

3 MR. HOSKING: I can appreciate what you're saying
4 and I think it can be resolved, but it does warrant additional
5 discussion and resolution in more detail before I'm willing
6 to accept what's presented.

7 MR. THRALL: Okay.

8 MR. HOSKING: I'd also like to suggest, Tom, that the
9 operation of the EFO here, the way it's described, be
10 compared to the way it's described with the Bradley Lake
11 project, because there are a few discrepancies as to how
12 the situation would work.

13 MR. ARMINSKI: Okay.

14 MR. HOSKING: And I think that it ought to be a
15 consistent presentation by the Power Authority for all the
16 projects that are involved.

17 MR. ARMINSKI: Okay.

18 MR. HOSKING: And I'd be glad to sit down with anybody
19 and work out discrepancies and that sort of thing that I
20 come up with between the difference on the two of them.

21 MR. ARMINSKI: Yeah, I guess one of the things that I
22 just have to say is that a lot of how this will work hinges
23 upon the construction management of the project. And you
24 know, we're not at the point of having developed that right
25 now, so there may -- while there are similarities between



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 the projects, they may not be managed in the same manner.

2 MR. HOSKING: Jack, I'm not ready to sign off on this
3 one.

4 MR. ROBINSON: Okay.

5 MR. THRALL: I'm not trying to get anything out of you
6 like that. The basic concept, though, that this guy should
7 have some teeth, and that the contractor should be aware of
8 and had made provision for complying with these, whatever
9 the environmental conditions are, is that something that
10 you basically consider.....

11 MR. HOSKING: Yes, I commend the thing the way it's
12 set up on paper. I think it's real good.

13 MR. THRALL: Your question is the details of how it
14 would actually be enforced?

15 MR. HOSKING: Right, the implementation and so forth.

16 MR. ROSENBERG: Just for the -- just to be sure I have
17 this straight. On page 14 on that resident fish section,
18 that's going to be struck and there's going to be a new
19 paragraph or paragraphs on resident fish and monitoring?

20 MR. GILBERTSON: Yeah. We'll revise this to point out
21 that we will be monitoring resident fishes starting in FY
22 '86. Actually it started -- excuse me. Some initial work
23 has been going on the last two years in establishing index
24 areas and some.....

25 MR. ROSENBERG: Okay. I was also under the impression



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 -- I think it's from that resident juvenile report -- that
2 there were two, 3,000 rainbows in that section which I
3 think is a fairly sufficient quantity. And I think that's
4 somewhat similar to the number of, say, Coho's; is that --
5 Do you know if that's correct? Because here it says that.....

6 MR. GILBERTSON: Well, there would be more Coho juveniles
7 in the area.

8 MR. ROSENBERG: Okay. It says that their population
9 numbers appear to be low compared with the salmon species;
10 and I wasn't so sure that that was correct compared to all
11 the salmon species. I'll have.....

12 MR. MARCHEGIANI: It depends on what.....

13 MR. ROSENBERG:to go back and check on that, get
14 a time of year.

15 MR. MARCHEGIANI: It depends on what you genetically
16 are saying; or whether you're saying all the species or
17 you're saying one specific species.

18 MR. ROSENBERG: I'm saying any one given specific
19 species.

20 MR. GILBERTSON: One of the things that we have to
21 face in developing a monitoring plan is that some of the
22 species are going to be difficult to monitor just because
23 when you go out on the river and sample you don't catch
24 very many of them; and unless you go to some specific sites,
25 Coho is one of them.



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 MR. ROSENBERG: Yeah, I can appreciate that.

2 MR. GILBERTSON: And rainbow, you can go out and
3 catch a reasonable number of them at certain times of the
4 year in certain places, but in -- you know, if you were just
5 to go out on any given day during the summer and hit any
6 given stretch on the river, you'd have a really difficult
7 time getting enough -- catching enough to have any statistical
8 meaning or merit. And so that's one of the things that we
9 have to deal with when we're looking at this resident fish
10 monitoring, is exactly how can we monitor them from a
11 statistical point of view.

12 MR. HOSKING: It is a problem, but it's still a
13 requirement as far as our mitigation policy goes. On page
14 6, for example, it talks about the critical life history
15 stages of fish, including down at the bottom where it
16 concludes adult salmon. And then on the next page, egg
17 incubation, juvenile rearing and outmigration; and I'd like
18 to see numbers of resident species included right here as an
19 item specifically identified in the monitoring program.

20 MR. GILBERTSON: Would you be willing to live with
21 abundance rather than -- or densities rather than numbers?

22 MR. HOSKING: The problem.....

23 MR. GILBERTSON: It's kind of a tricky question, but if
24 we're going to use a catch per effort model, we're really
25 talking about densities. We're not trying to estimate the



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 number of fish. That's what I'm getting at.

2 MR. HOSKING: Yeah. We want some sort of a relative
3 figure that we can compare from one situation to the next.
4 I think we're talking the same thing.

5 MR. GILBERTSON: Right, we are.

6 MR. ARMINSKI: Anything else? It looks at this point
7 as if we're for sure not going to make it. Is there anybody
8 that can't come back this afternoon that has an interest in
9 a paper that we should discuss this morning? Bob, you came
10 in from Palmer or Big Lake?

11 CHLUPACH: Yeah. It doesn't make any difference.

12 MR. ARMINSKI: Okay. Let's start back up at the top,
13 W-13, Human Activity/Wildlife Disturbance.

14 MR. FAIRBANKS: Okay. Do you want to go through 19?

15 MR. ARMINSKI: Okay. Let's do 19. I'm sorry.

16 MR. FAIRBANKS: Well, this paper just basically presents
17 conceptual measures for monitoring wildlife botanical
18 resources. It's based on measures presented in the license
19 application and the BMP manuals; and it's basically thrown
20 out for your comments. The whole monitoring plan is in
21 detail in preparation right now and will be included in the
22 mitigation plan which is due to the -- at least the first
23 version of the monitoring aspect in the mitigation plan will
24 be available this summer. So this can be made available
25 for comments, and your comments then can be incorporated



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 into the actual plans being developed separately from this.

2 MR. HOSKING: I have the same sort of comment, Randy, on
3 page 3. In the first paragraph of that, it says by incor-
4 porating the environmental concerns and so forth. I'm just
5 not willing yet to make that assumption that the concerns
6 will be enforced in the field.

7 MR. FAIRBANKS: You're talking about EFO division and
8 how it operates.

9 MR. HOSKING: Right.

10 MR. ROSENBERG: Yeah, I had that same comment. I guess
11 that's number 13 -- what? -- number 13 of the mitigation?

12 MR. FAIRBANKS: Right.

13 MR. ROSENBERG: We're not willing to make that assumption
14 either.

15 MR. FAIRBANKS: Okay.

16 MR. LINDSAY: Are you guys saying that there'll be
17 things that come up in the field that can't be possibly
18 covered on paper. I don't understand what your concern is.

19 MR. HOSKING: What my concern is that regardless of
20 this person who is out there, if he works day by day, there
21 are going to be situations that have to be handled immediately.
22 You've got a bulldozer idling right there. Too many times
23 I have seen construction managers brush environmental concerns
24 aside and set the bulldozer in motion.

25 MR. THRALL: Again, the intent is to avoid that.



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3643

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 MR. HASKING: I know what the intent is.

2 MR. THRALL: But I understand. I think I understand
3 what it is you would like to see.

4 MR. LATTA: You can only shut a job down so many times
5 when you start delaying the completion of the project, and
6 that's where the pressure comes in.

7 MR. THRALL: Yeah. And our intent is we put this
8 together in such a way that the contractor knows what we're
9 trying to avoid is someone out there, you know, baring his
10 chest to the bulldozer and causing, you know, everybody a
11 lot of problem; and the contractor being able to say, you
12 know: Well, this is costing me time and money and, you know,
13 I didn't know anything about this, and this is the way I'm
14 supposed to do it. We're trying to have it as clear-cut
15 as we possibly can so that the contractor has been clearly
16 told and has signed the contract that says you do certain
17 things in certain ways. And you avoid these. And maybe
18 part of it is -- and there's some additional authority on
19 an ad hoc.

20 MR. HOSKING: Okay. In the technical meeting, I think
21 we can address measures to.....

22 MR. THRALL: Right.

23 MR. HOSKING:satisfactorily meet our concerns.

24 MR. THRALL: And I think the thing is that when we'll
25 finally see how this works is when the contract documents



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 go out. And one of your, probably, concerns will be to
2 somehow be involved in what that is.....

3 MR. HOSKING: Right.

4 MR. THRALL:what those conditions really turn out
5 to be.

6 MR. ROSENBERG: Another concern of ours was the -- I
7 believe it's in this paper, the mention of not funding any
8 agency positions, or funding any agency involvement in the
9 post-construction monitoring.

10 MR. HOSKING: That was in number 12, Dan, that specific
11 statement.

12 MR. ROSENBERG: That was in number 12. Let's go back
13 to that for a minute. We feel that this project will cause
14 a great deal of agency involvement and that the Power
15 Authority should be responsible for funding some of that.
16 What level is something that I think we should discuss. I
17 don't think we -- we don't want to rule out at this point in
18 time that the Power Authority will not fund any agency
19 involvement in this monitoring process, or post-construction
20 process.

21 MR. ARMINSKI: Okay. I guess our feeling was that
22 earlier on a point was raised that there should be a Power
23 Authority funded agency monitoring team. And this monitoring
24 team would be basically a field team that would spend time
25 on the project. And I think that the proposal -- or it was



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 thought that this might be similar to the JAFWAT thing on
2 the pipeline. And I guess our position is that we feel that
3 we'd all be better served if we established the EFO, and
4 through contractual means strive to keep things in an
5 environmentally sensible -- operated in a sensible manner.
6 That's not to say that we might not fund a position such as
7 your position or DNR's positions. We have -- or say with
8 Fish and Game, and DNR -- to continually work with us on
9 this project and other Power Authority projects. And also,
10 that's not to say that we won't have agency people out in
11 the field where we would fund meals, lodging, transportation
12 at the site and whatever. But the concept that we're trying
13 to get away from is continual maintenance of a monitoring --
14 agency monitoring team out in the field.

15 MR. ROSENBERG: Okay. In addition to that EFO, we do
16 think that it's going to be necessary to have some level
17 of agency involvement in the field.

18 MR. ARMINSKI: So we agree.

19 MR. ROSENBERG: Yeah.

20 MR. ARMINSKI: Leroy?

21 MR. LATTA: We have still got a pipeline coordinator,
22 Bruce Stafford; and you might want to talk to Alyeska and
23 see how they've worked that. They might provide some kind
24 of a model.

25 MR. ROSENBERG: My understanding is that that's being



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 done away with.

2 MR. LATTA: Yeah, I think it is tapering off, but it's
3 been several years since the pipeline was done.

4 MR. ARMINSKI: Other comments on W-19?

5 MR. ROSENBERG: I have a few on these -- on page ii
6 on the second page. On there, number 2, we feel that records
7 of impoundment crossing and impoundment-caused mortality
8 will be collected. It should also be collected in the winter-
9 time. There may be possibilities for mortality during the
10 winter because of ice shelving.

11 MR. FAIRBANKS: Yeah, that was an oversight.

12 MR. ARMINSKI: Bruce?

13 MR. BEDARD: Has there been any kind of a studies done
14 on that to date of mortalities? The Yukon River, every year,
15 you can see lots of caribou when breakup comes. Apparently
16 it's soft spots in the ice and they can't get back out and
17 they drown. Has any kind of study been done on the Susitna
18 similarity so that you'd have some kind of -- you might have
19 someone accuse you later of killing caribou if they see some.
20 You'd be able to see them much better in slow-moving water.

21 MR. FAIRBANKS: That's true.

22 MR. BEDARD: That's okay.

23 MR. FAIRBANKS: Other than the movement and distribution
24 studies that, you know, that have been conducted, there
25 haven't been any specific studies of that. The caribou in



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 the project area don't typically move in mass to cross the
2 river. And aside from having somebody stationed all along
3 the river for days and days at a time, I don't know how you'd
4 really study it other than the fact that we've had a lot of
5 people out in the field observing.

6 MR. BEDARD: I just thought I'd bring that up, because
7 I do know that any time you construct a dam project then
8 somebody will come back on you later and say: You've got
9 no facts to show that there was any mortality prior to that.

10 MR. FAIRBANKS: We know that there are accidents that
11 occur in the field right now. We have documents that some
12 of the radio-collared animals have died through drownings,
13 particularly moose. I don't know if we have documented any
14 caribou drownings yet, but we have documented some moose
15 drownings when they're attempting to cross some of the
16 streams in the project area, not necessarily the Susitna.
17 I think one of them was crossing the Susitna. It was a calf.
18 And another one was documented when it was trying to cross
19 Susitna Creek, I think. But you know, we've documented that
20 there are some accidents that occur; but the total extent
21 of that is really difficult to put your finger on.

22 MR. ROSENBERG: Shall I go on? I have some more here.

23 MR. ARMINSKI: Sure. Please.

24 MR. ROSENBERG: Under number 3, moose, we'd like also
25 -- what it says is: throughout the license period to document



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 the browse production of lands enhanced for moose. I'd like
2 to add to that: not only browse production, but use by
3 moose.

4 MR. FAIRBANKS: Okay.

5 MR. ROSENBERG: Next, number 5. That is just contingent
6 on the discussion from -- what was it? -- W-5, the sheep
7 use of Jay Creek.

8 MR. FAIRBANKS: Right.

9 MR. ROSENBERG: That population level effect, we talked
10 about just what that means and all. Once we get the other
11 one settled.....

12 MR. FAIRBANKS: Right.

13 MR. ROSENBERG:we can settle that in here. The
14 number 6, we'd like someone to keep track or monitor,
15 essentially, nuisance bear instances and try to associate
16 it with mortalities resulting from that or other factors;
17 just to sort of keep track of that officially.

18 MR. FAIRBANKS: Right.

19 MR. ROSENBERG: And we do have pretty good data on bear
20 distribution and habitat use, pre-project information, and
21 we'd like to see that continued post-project to ascertain
22 any changes that may result from the project.

23 MR. FAIRBANKS: All right. I'm just taking down all
24 of your comments here and we'll all consider them in
25 developing the final mitigation or monitoring plan.



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3643

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 MR. ROSENBERG: Okay. And on number 10 I have a
2 question on swans. Are there molting swans up there?

3 MR. FAIRBANKS: Swan observations have been really
4 scarce. The only ones we've seen. Now there's no real
5 congregations of them. We've just seen occasional swans, I
6 think, at Stephan Lake. The only ones that have even been
7 observed even, I think, nesting are closest to Stephan Lake.
8 And then there's a little pond up the east fork of Watana
9 Creek, a long ways from the project features. Other than
10 that, we haven't seen any.

11 MR. ROSENBERG: Okay. My concern there was just --
12 well, it was a concern for molting swans and swan broods
13 being identified.....

14 MR. FAIRBANKS: Okay.

15 MR. ROSENBERG:you know, throughout the construction
16 phase, so that activities can be regulated around those;
17 not just nests, but any swans with broods during the brooding
18 period.....

19 MR. FAIRBANKS: All right.

20 MR. ROSENBERG:and if there are molting concen-
21 trations during the molting. And I think that's all I had.

22 MR. ARMINSKI: Leroy?

23 MR. LATTA: Just an update on the Dall Creek -- I mean,
24 Jay Creek mineral lick. Five of the mining claims were

25

* * * * *



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3643

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 closed, and three of the new ones that we can't -- we don't
2 even have mailing addresses for the miners. But five of
3 the ones that were on the status plat were closed in the
4 last week. Got it verbal from Jerry Gallagher yesterday,
5 and as soon as we get through with Bradley, we'll get back
6 on that and get you some more information.

7 MR. ROSENBERG: Okay. What close are they in? And
8 what does closed mean?

9 MR. LATTA: Basically, I got this second-hand from
10 Debbie as I was walking out the door. She said they're
11 closed, and I assume that means that they've either withdrawn
12 their application or they've closed it for some other reason.

13 MR. ROSENBERG: Oh, I see. Okay.

14 MR. FAIRBANKS: What claims are you talking about are
15 the ones that you sent over?

16 MR. LATTA: The ones that are plotted on the status
17 map currently, five of those were closed. Of the ones that
18 aren't plotted, three of them we don't have a mailing address
19 so we can't get ahold of the miner to even find out -- you
20 know, to get anything over to the phone as to where it's
21 located.

22 MR. BEDARD: This is at Jay Creek?

23 MR. LATTA: Jay Creek, yes.

24 MR. ROSENBERG: I'd say those would be invalid claims.

25 MR. LATTA: I don't -- I guess Mary Kaye would have been



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 the one to speak to that.

2 MR. BEDARD: Do you have the dates of entry on those?

3 MR. LATTA: We haven't spent a whole lot of time on
4 that because we're trying to get Bradley done by next week.

5 MR. BEDARD: If you had dates of entry, in essence,
6 prior to August 31, '71 -- if they were prior to that they
7 may possibly be valid, but after that no way.

8 MR. ARMINSKI: Okay.

9 MR. MARCHEGIANI: Dan, just so that I understand where
10 you're coming from, and Randy does, when you said for your
11 discussion of bears that a lot of information was collected
12 and whatnot, and that you kind of expect the studies to
13 continue in that area, do you mean at the same level, like
14 presumably collars and whatnot?

15 MR. ROSENBERG: Just at a level sufficient -- whatever
16 level is necessary to be able to detect changes in habitat
17 use distribution.

18 MR. MARCHEGIANI: Just to know what you were looking for.

19 MR. ROSENBERG: Whatever's decided to be appropriate,
20 yeah. That doesn't necessarily.....

21 MR. ARMINSKI: Okay. Let's move on to W-13. Our
22 position is that we propose to mitigate human activities and
23 our monitoring will serve to determine whether the mitigation
24 measures are effective. Randy?

25 MR. FAIRBANKS: Okay. This paper is pretty



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 straightforward. The sources of it is, anyway, based on
2 review of the general literature on disturbance effects on
3 wildlife; review of other large projects, hydroelectric and
4 large development projects such as Terror Lake, and their
5 effects; and review of other mitigation measures or
6 restrictions related to disturbance that have been proposed
7 or implemented on other projects. The paper, although it
8 doesn't really make it clear, it really does deal with
9 construction activities. The issue is not -- I mean, implies
10 that but it doesn't come out and say it; but that's what
11 we're limiting this paper to. So, any comments?

12 MR. ARMINSKI: Comments?

13 MR. LATTA: Just -- I should have brought it with me,
14 but we had a meeting with DOT's aviation planners and I was
15 just going to suggest that you get ahold of them on this.
16 They were in yesterday talking about, on a state-wide basis
17 -- talking airstrips. And they've got quite a bunch of big
18 plans they may put together. I don't know. Anyway, you
19 should get ahold of them. I've got their address and phone
20 number back at the office. I'll call you.

21 MR. FAIRBANKS: Plans regarding?

22 MR. LATTA: Well, they're putting together a state-wide
23 aviation plan that covers everything from maintenance to
24 who puts out NOTAM's. I mean, it's just very comprehensive
25 state-wide plan.



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 MR. ARMINSKI: Dan, did you have a comment?

2 MR. ROSENBERG: Please, yeah, a couple of things. First
3 on sheep, there have been sheep located down by Vee Canyon,
4 identified, and there's possibly another lick area down there.
5 And we would just like that to be included in the, sort of,
6 pre-project monitoring. I mean, essentially these mitigation
7 measures that apply to sheep at Jay Creek should also apply
8 to sheep at Vee Canyon.

9 MR. FAIRBANKS: That's true. That'll happen if, in
10 fact, we can document there is a lick there. Last year is
11 the first time they were ever seen out there, and I don't
12 think there was any observation of licking activities. But
13 we'll continue to look for sheep in that area and if it does
14 happen -- we'll certainly look.

15 MR. ROSENBERG: Okay. And the dates on the second page,
16 Mitigation Measures Endorsed by the APA, number 2, still on
17 sheep here. The dates April 15th to June 15th should be
18 changed to May 1st and July 15th, according to the report,
19 the sheep report, under the big game studies.

20 MR. FAIRBANKS: Okay. May 1st and July 15th is the
21 recommendation?

22 MR. ROSENBERG: Yeah, and that should just be consistent.
23 That's mentioned several times.

24 MR. FAIRBANKS: Okay.

25 MR. ROSENBERG: The other recommendation that that report



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3643

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 made was that it should be prohibited -- project related
2 aircraft landings should be prohibited within one mile of
3 the mineral lick as opposed to half a mile. That was the
4 recommendation in the report.

5 MR. FAIRBANKS: Okay. We'll consider that.

6 MR. ROSENBERG: Okay.

7 MR. FAIRBANKS: So you're talking -- okay. That's
8 number 2.

9 MR. ROSENBERG: And also for consideration is that in
10 the report on big game studies, line 5 on wolves, the
11 recommendation there -- this refers to number 4 on this list
12 -- is that project related aircraft landings should be
13 prohibited within a mile-and-a-half of known active wolf
14 dens.

15 MR. FAIRBANKS: Okay.

16 MR. ROSENBERG: And number 8, page 7 of the executive
17 summary -- I just want to reiterate in regards to swans that
18 it should be during nesting, rearing and molting season if
19 indeed there are molting swans.

20 MR. FAIRBANKS: All right.

21 MR. ROSENBERG: And then just to be consistent, as I
22 said before, on number 10, the dates of May 1st to July 15th
23 and the one-mile distance.

24 MR. FAIRBANKS: Un-huh.

25 MR. ROSENBERG: On number 11, that should also apply



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3643

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 to the Jay Creek mineral lick site.

2 MR. FAIRBANKS: Yeah. I think number 10 was intended
3 to cover.....

4 MR. ROSENBERG: Yeah, it may be redundant in that sense.
5 And I believe that's all I have.

6 MR. MARCHEGIANI: I have a question, Dan.

7 MR. ROSENBERG: All right.

8 MR. MARCHEGIANI: It kind of, I think, confronts the
9 issue, and maybe I'm off base a little bit, but maybe you
10 could straighten me away. I think there's a State policy,
11 or some Fish and Game policy, as far as shooting wolves,
12 and now we're worried about landing a mile-and-a-half away
13 from wolves. Maybe there's a scarcity of wolves in the
14 Susitna area and they got too many up north. Could you
15 clarify that?

16 MR. ROSENBERG: You did give me the opportunity to say
17 you were off base.

18 MR. MARCHEGIANI: I'm kind of ignorant when it comes
19 to wolves, but at least the Department has been shooting
20 wolves. I'd like kind of a clarification.

21 MR. ROSENBERG: Yeah, I believe the Department's
22 management strategy for, as far as aerial wolf hunting goes,
23 is related to -- geographically related.

24 MR. LOWENFELS: It's also in suspension now.

25 MR. ROSENBERG: It's also in suspension now.



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 MR. MARCHEGIANI: That clarifies the issue. There's a
2 number of people that would ask us the same question, why
3 moving something around for a mile-and-a-half around a
4 wolf den.....

5 MR. ROSENBERG: Yeah, we're looking at individual
6 populations, I believe; and I think this is a separate
7 population than those that are being managed otherwise.

8 MR. LATTA: Maybe we could just fly them down as a
9 mitigation measure.

10 MR. ROSENBERG: Or we could take a break now.

11 MR. ARMINSKI: Any other comments on this position
12 paper?

13 MR. FAIRBANKS: Of course, all these restrictions on
14 distance and time, you set them up with the idea that you
15 are going to try to meet all of them. There are some
16 construction activities that just have to be done to build
17 the dam, and so there are certain -- you know, if a wolf
18 den is in the wrong place, it's not going to be avoided.
19 But if it's in an area that is 10 miles from the dam then
20 there's no need for people to be making project related
21 aircraft landings close by. We can institute the restrictions
22 and monitor their success.

23 MR. ROSENBERG: You know, in some of these, like the
24 Nelchina calving grounds of the Nelchina caribou herd which
25 is in here, is there even a need to operate in that area at all?



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 MR. FAIRBANKS: Probably not.

2 MR. THRALL: I think there's probably no hard-and-fast
3 project need to go in certain areas, but when the project
4 is on-going there are going to be, just as there now are,
5 people, various specialists, going out to the project site
6 for various reasons and they'll want to be looking at a
7 lot of various -- not just the dam site. And they'll have
8 legitimate purposes for doing that. Like anybody else, you
9 want to familiarize yourself with the area that you're going
10 to be working in; or you'll be asked to make judgments and
11 you'll ask to see the upper basin or something. And it's
12 important, then, to have restrictions if that guy says for
13 some reason, says: I'd like to set down here. I'd like
14 to land here and look at this, you know, geological feature
15 or something. As to this, those things can happen. If you
16 have those restrictions then it's very clear-cut. If you
17 want to do that, we'll have to clear that area. This is not
18 the time to do it.

19 MR. MARCHEGIANI: A good example, that might be a
20 climate station. We might just want to talk climate station
21 in a certain area. Gee, that's not a good place to put it
22 for these reasons.

23 MR. ARMINSKI: Okay. Any more discussion on this one?
24 I see everybody's looking at their watches so we have an
25 opportunity to quit and come back.



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 MR. ROBINSON: Which ones do we have left?

2 MR. LOWENFELS: Let's take a five-minute break if we're
3 going to go through it.

4 MR. ARMINSKI: Five minutes.

5 (Break)

6 MR. ARMINSKI: R-2, hunting and recreational trapping.
7 Rick, do you want to take that one, please.

8 MR. SUTTLE: Sure. Do you.....

9 MR. ARMINSKI: Do I want to say our position? Our
10 position is that the project will reduce availability of
11 moose, black bear and brown bear in the area. This
12 reduction will affect the hunting experience and demand and
13 location and expectations in the area. However, the project
14 will provide improved access in the area. And let's see,
15 as far as trapping, our position is that it would not affect
16 significantly recreational trapping. Furthermore, I think
17 the Board of Game would -- may be involved in revising
18 management goals in the area.

19 MR. SUTTLE: Hank?

20 MR. HOSKING: On your executive summary the position
21 is.....

22 MR. ARMINSKI: Can we.....

23 MR. SUTTLE: I'm sorry. That's my fault.

24 MR. ARMINSKI: Yeah. Let's hear from Rick.

25 MR. SUTTLE: Let me run through a quick approach here.



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 My fault, Hank. I've got a couple corrections I need to
2 make anyway.

3 MR. HOSKING: Oh, thank you. You'll take care of my
4 questions.

5 MR. SUTTLE: Yeah, maybe. Basically the approach was
6 to pull together wildlife population information and hunting
7 use data, and evaluate that with respect to the issue as
8 it's stated. The sources were mostly the ADF&G, Fish and
9 Game, big game studies by Ballard and Miller and Pitcher;
10 and a review of the specific hunting, or harvest, information
11 that they have that's set up by the specific reporting code
12 units in the project area; as well as a review of the
13 information and license application, particularly chapter
14 3, fish and wildlife. With respect to trapping, we've
15 reviewed the data that did exist -- and that's basically in
16 the license application, chapter 3 -- and some of the recent
17 fur bear studies done by Phil Gipson, which should be spelled
18 with a "p" instead of a "b" in my paper. A couple other ones
19 before we get into it, a couple comments and corrections, to
20 the position on page 1. That first sentence should be struck
21 and the first sentence on page 1 of the position should be
22 interjected in that.

23 MR. THRALL: Could you repeat that? I'm not sure
24 everybody caught it, what you're trying to do.

25 MR. SUTTLE: On page 1, the first sentence says: It is



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 the Alaska Power Authority's position that the project will
2 not significantly affect the availability of game in the area.
3 That should be struck and the correction will be what's on
4 the executive summary: It is the Alaska Power Authority's
5 position that the project will reduce the availability of
6 moose, black bear and brown bear in the area. Now, on page
7 4, just a minor one in the third paragraph, the second to
8 last sentence where it says Parks Highway. That's actually
9 Denali Highway.

10 MR. ARMINSKI: Take it away.

11 MR. HOSKING: You got it.

12 MR. ROBINSON: That took care of it, right, eh?

13 MR. HOSKING: You bet.

14 MR. LOWENFELS: I'm still trying to find the correction
15 on page 4. I think it was page 4.

16 MR. ARMINSKI: Yeah. What was the question on page 4
17 again?

18 MR. SUTTLE: Third paragraph, second to last sentence
19 says: young bull moose in areas of GMU 13 near the Parks
20 Highway. And it's Denali Highway.

21 MR. LOWENFELS: You get the hidden martini award. No
22 one else here knew that was a mistake.

23 MR. HOSKING: Sorry I read it.

24 MR. ARMINSKI: Okay. Leroy, do you have a comment?

25 MR. LATTA: I was just going to say our recreational



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 people didn't have any problems with it.

2 MR. LOWENFELS: They should have. Fire them.

3 MR. LATTA: Hey, we're going to get out of here by noon.

4 MR. BEDARD: I do have some comments. They're mild.

5 The recreational trapping, at least on our land, is not
6 going to occur. We're not going to allow it. I thought I'd
7 let that be known. Trapping right now isn't profitable
8 anyhow, and we don't foresee recreational trapping as a
9 benefit. On page iii where it says at the top: Users
10 that presently fly into the area disturbed by project
11 features for a remote hunting experience will be adversely
12 affected by the project. Well, whether the project goes or
13 not we feel that's going to change anyhow by virtue of our
14 land ownership. And I thought that should be known. Right
15 below that, Recreational Trapping, I had a question on the
16 first one. The number of trappers presently in the project
17 impoundment areas does not appear to be large (between 7 and
18 9). My question is: Where? I've never seen trappers out
19 there, at least on the lands that are within the dam itself
20 or south of that. There might be some trappers in the north
21 part of the Talkeetna River and portions of the -- the seven
22 portions of the Prairie Creek, but I don't know of any in
23 that real remote area that I know of. I know of a guy from
24 Cantwell who married a Native. He and his wife do some
25 limited trapping, primarily in the Butte Lake, Deadman Lake



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 area. Is that what you're referring to?

2 MR. FAIRBANKS: I think most of the trapping -- this
3 was based on a survey that Phil Gipson did and the trappers
4 that they found, they were trapping over by the reservoir.
5 Most of them were at the upper part of the Watana reservoir.
6 There's several of them near the mouth of Oshetna River
7 and Goose Creek, and then there was one or two trappers that
8 have trapped Watana Creek and Tsusena Creek areas.

9 MR. BEDARD: Okay. We also feel that, at least at
10 present under the pricing of furs, that the project should
11 not, in our opinion, cause any inducement to increased
12 trapping. And again, like I said, we're not going to allow
13 recreational trapping. There might be some permit trapping
14 allowed if the price of furs go up. We'll allow them access
15 to our land, but right now our plans do not have it. Also,
16 under mitigation measures, we would like to add a three in
17 there: Proposed agreements with CIRI Native corporations to
18 open lands to wildlife mitigation and recreational uses,
19 we'd like to have that put in as a mitigation thing which we
20 are presently working on. But I think it should be worded
21 here that that could be a mitigation measure.

22 MR. ARMINSKI: Earlier you made a statement that you
23 wouldn't allow recreational trapping. But if we reached an
24 agreement to use Native lands for recreation, would that
25 then allow recreational trapping on those lands?



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 MR. BEDARD: We would have to look at the terms of the
2 agreement that we worked out, what type of things that that
3 would include. And we don't see recreational trapping as
4 a viable industry anyway. At least at this time, I don't
5 think of any.

6 MR. ARMINSKI: It's not. I guess in my mind recreational
7 trapping is not an industry. You go out there for fun.
8 It's more or less to get out.

9 MR. MARCHEGIANI: Bruce, do you feel, you know, that
10 that is something we can address at the time that it is an
11 option? The option's not closed?

12 MR. BEDARD: It's not closed, but we would -- right
13 now the way we're looking at it, our intent is not to allow
14 recreational trapping, because there is some subsistence
15 Natives that may feel that -- that are shareholders of our
16 corporation -- that may feel an infringement, maybe, on
17 some special subsistence privilege that they have; and we
18 have to look further into that. But our position is right
19 now to keep closed until we have more of our own internal
20 studies.

21 MR. FAIRBANKS: Bruce, are you saying also that you
22 would prohibit big game hunting?

23 MR. BEDARD: No, no. That's different. We're actually
24 looking at that as part of our recreational plan for final
25 development which is one of the big businesses there at



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3643

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 present.

2 MR. FAIRBANKS: I thought you said earlier that even if
3 the project doesn't go that wilderness hunting would not....

4 MR. BEDARD: No, I didn't say wilderness hunting. I
5 said recreational trapping. Certain areas may be closed, and
6 I was referring to a McNeil river concept of the brown bear
7 migration area. We're looking at that as, possibly --
8 trying to see how we can develop a four-square mile area as
9 a preservation site whether the project goes or not, and that
10 is going to depend a lot on whether we can get help from the
11 State -- from the Feds to develop such a concept.

12 MR. LATTA: Wave your hand at him.

13 MR. BEDARD: But that's in our own, you know, internal
14 policy.

15 MR. ARMINSKI: You don't need money to do nothing.

16 MR. BEDARD: Well, it's not really doing nothing. You
17 still have to build a tower, a viewing tower, of some type;
18 and a caged in area to protect the people who are going to
19 study the bears, if it's towards viewing the bears; and you
20 want to control trails to that site off in the more
21 accessible areas.

22 MR. ROSENBERG: I need to make clear, Bruce, and I
23 think you're aware of it, that if you do want to develop
24 that area for recreational use, to view bears or whatever,
25 and you want that on a long term, four square miles may not



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 be very sufficient to keep those bears coming back to the
2 Prairie Creek area.

3 MR. BEDARD: Yeah, that's the thing we're looking into.
4 Right now the minimum I recommended was four square miles.
5 And I have to work with two Native groups on that because
6 it's two different landowners that have that area. So far
7 one Native group says: Yeah, I can fork over four square
8 miles, but the other one hasn't given me any commitment.
9 So I can't speak to the other one in that relationship until I
10 get some more commitments, trying to convince them that it
11 is a plus to their overall recreational plan by incorporating
12 that. It's my own personal feeling and it's something that
13 I've been pushing for for several years. Also, on page 5
14 on the bottom, it says: Unregulated ATV use off the access
15 road could result in considerable impact. We agree with that.
16 And again, on our land we will want that regulated; and we
17 will regulate that, again, whether the project goes or not.
18 We're not going to allow any type of ATV use within our
19 land borders. I would suggest the same thing, maybe, for
20 the project area, at least within a certain perimeter. You
21 might want to identify areas where you wouldn't want that
22 type of use, because it can be damaging. You can look up
23 there now and fly over and you can see ATV trails, and it
24 looks like superhighways. Now again, on closing the roads,
25 with the two Native groups -- it's actually three, but two --



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 one wants open use and the other is not really committed yet
2 whether they want any kind of open use -- of course, that's
3 Knik -- and until we can all, ourselves, internally get
4 together on this, I can't take no position on it. But it's
5 difficult because one side is saying that we want access and
6 the other side is saying we want access, but we want nobody
7 else to have it. And so I have a little problem with that
8 myself, you know, to make a presentation. I just want it
9 to be known that we're still working on that. Now on the
10 page 8 where it says: Land management plans of Native
11 landowners will largely determine the future of trapping
12 south of the river. Again, our plans may include restrictions
13 in our permits. I'll leave that open that way. That's it.

14 MR. MARCHEGIANI: Bruce, do you foresee within the next
15 six months the question being internally answered as far as
16 access?

17 MR. BEDARD: I'm hoping sooner than that, because
18 either this month or next month the balance of 142,000 acres
19 will be conveyed, and CIRI has 10 days to convey that to the
20 villages. And what I've done, I've broken it down, the
21 whole area, in three management districts. And then I have
22 submanagement plans built into that because of the
23 different land owners which is CIRI, Knik, Chickaloon and
24 and Tyonek. We're still in doubt of whether Chickaloon will
25 own any land there at all. They have not been conveyed any



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 to date. Tyonek and Knik has, primarily most of the river
2 corridor.

3 MR. MARCHEGIANI: Is it fair to say that we would
4 expect a recommendation from you six months or earlier?

5 MR. BEDARD: I would hope. And my personal feeling is
6 I'm hoping as soon as conveyance is done I can set them
7 down at a table where we can discuss how this project is
8 actually going to affect their lands and what they want
9 out of this. I'll ask them directly, you know: What do
10 you want out of this? What are you willing to forego and
11 what are you willing not to forego? And I can have something
12 better to present. Right now these are strictly things we
13 have discussed on a summary basis without making it concrete.

14 MR. ARMINSKI: Dan?

15 MR. ROSENBERG: Okay. A couple of comments on the
16 second page of the executive summary under use of game
17 resource. I just wanted to point out that on the third
18 one down it says: Many black and brown bears harvested are
19 taken by people hunting moose or caribou, which is also
20 considered to be an incidental harvest. But I just wanted
21 to mention that the use -- or the number of people hunting
22 exclusively for brown bears, which is in the springtime,
23 has been increasing steadily in Game Management Unit 13
24 since 1980; and in 1980, which was the first year that that
25 Game Management Unit was open for spring hunting, there were,



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 I believe, 18 percent of the harvest was spring harvest.
2 And then it's increased every year up 'til 1984 where 37
3 percent of the harvest of brown bears was a spring harvest.
4 So there are -- or there is an increase in the number of
5 black and brown bears being harvested in the spring in
6 addition to those incidental harvests in the fall during
7 moose and caribou hunting.

8 MR. BEDARD: It may be greater next season because of
9 that big article the Times put in about bow hunters. It kind of
10 made it kind of attractive with nice pictures of bears all
11 over the place.

12 MR. ROSENBERG: I wanted to bring that up. The second
13 comment, it says: Hunting of Dall sheep is not expected
14 to increase significantly. The whole project is predicated
15 on the fact that there's going to be a large population
16 growth, and that's why we need all this additional power.
17 So I think consistent with that is a percentage of those
18 people are going to be hunting; and so I think that we can
19 expect an increase in all types of hunting.

20 MR. SUTTLE: I think one question I have on that, Dan,
21 I think what that should be reflecting is that the -- I
22 think the one study that mentioned Dall sheep, that most of
23 the legal rams are all taken right now. So I think you're
24 probably going to need some clarification on that, the
25 hunting pressure, the amount of hunting increase, with the



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 overall impact on the resource in terms of taking legal rams
2 shouldn't change much.

3 MR. ROSENBERG: Okay. Along those lines the bottom of
4 that page, it says: The proposed access road may redistribute
5 the heavy hunting use that now occurs along the Denali
6 Highway. I believe that it will just extend rather than
7 redistribute the heavy hunting pressure for those same
8 reasons, that there will just be more and more of a demand
9 to hunt. So it really won't -- it may not redistribute it.
10 It may just extend that demand into an area.

11 MR. MARCHEGIANI: Is that more of a measurement type
12 thing where the Board of Game could just close hunting
13 within 5 miles of the access road?

14 MR. ROSENBERG: Board of Game regulations are not what
15 we're considering to be a mitigation measure.

16 MR. MARCHEGIANI: What I'm trying to say is: It's a
17 management tool; and part of what we've been told already
18 is that we're not making any recommendations as far as
19 management goes. I'm at kind of a loss. I'd ask the means
20 of dealing with it. I mean, the Department can either say,
21 well, there is going to be hunting pressure along the road
22 and allow it, or else they can turn around and restrict it.
23 We don't have any control of that.

24 MR. ARMINSKI: I'm not sure that Dan said, though, that
25 this is a bad thing, you know, that needs to be mitigated.



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 MR. MARCHEGIANI: Okay.

2 MR. ROSENBERG: I'm just clarifying what here is listed
3 as present knowledge, or access to the area, whatever. I'm
4 just trying to clarify the information that's presented here.
5 Other than that, the proposal on mitigation measures
6 endorsed by the Power Authority, I believe we've commented
7 on the recreation plan and on the proposed wildlife
8 mitigation measures in the license application; and I don't
9 know if we've gotten anything back on those comments yet
10 that I'm aware of. I'd have to check on that before I say
11 anything about that. But also additional refinements, are
12 those additional refinements that have already been made or
13 are those additional refinements that will come out in the
14 future?

15 MR. SUTTLE: I believe that was a reflection of the
16 additional mitigation measures, the mitigation planning
17 measures, that Randy is doing right now.

18 MR. ROSENBERG: So those additional refinements haven't
19 come out?

20 MR. FAIRBANKS: Yeah. They're not finalized.

21 MR. ROSENBERG: They're in addition to this document,
22 is what I'm asking.

23 MR. FAIRBANKS: Yeah.

24 MR. ROSENBERG: Okay. That's all I have.

25 MR. ARMINSKI: Okay. Anything else on this one? Okay.



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 The next one is R-3, our real position on whitewater boating.
2 S-5, need for public services and facilities. Basically
3 this relates to additional facilities that would have to be
4 provided to compensate for impacts of increased populations
5 on area communities. And our position is that by employing
6 the mitigation measures the impacts on these communities
7 would be insignificant except in Cantwell where a railhead
8 would be established and there would be an increase in
9 facilities required there. But, in fact, Cantwell has
10 expressed a desire to have their community increased. Okay.
11 Sharon, are you going to take that one?

12 MS. VAISSIERE: This paper was based mostly on
13 information from the license application and on projections
14 of the number of workers and their family members who would
15 be expected to live in area communities. And those were
16 based on the worst case where workers would use their own
17 personal vehicles to go to and from the project. The other
18 thing that they were based on were projections of facilities
19 and services requirements due to the population increases
20 in these communities. And what I looked at first were what
21 communities were most likely to be concerned, based on
22 the worst case projections and how facilities and services
23 are currently provided for in those communities; and then
24 summarized the projected facilities and services requirements
25 under this worst case scenario and stated the State's



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 responsibility to mitigate these facilities and services
2 effects; and finally outlined the most important mitigation
3 measure, and that being the worker transportation plan with
4 an impact management program and monitoring. Any discussion?

5 MR. ROSENBERG: I have no comments.

6 MR. LATTA: NJ, no jurisdiction.

7 MR. ARMINSKI: Okay. We'll have a revision of that
8 paper coming out. Okay, next one is F-2.6. This is the --
9 it deals with changing water quality parameters, in particular,
10 nutrients. Our position is that no mitigation measures are
11 required and that the impacts of the project on nutrients is
12 insignificant. Tom, are you going to take this?

13 MR. STUART: I think the three or four basic points that
14 I might make here, and what we try to make in this paper,
15 that is that the real question here, the issue at hand, is
16 how will nutrient changes caused by the project affect the
17 trophic status, and what will be the trophic status, of the
18 reservoirs and the downstream areas. It's our feeling at
19 the current time that under natural conditions there are
20 probably more than enough phosphorus and nitrogen micronutrients
21 to meet the demand in the river, and that other limiting
22 things in the environment probably supersede the available
23 quantities of nitrogen and phosphorus. We don't really
24 expect the project to reduce concentrations of nitrogen and
25 phosphorus to levels that would cause limitation of primary



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 productivity or to levels that would lessen the trophic
2 status of the stream downstream or the reservoirs themselves.
3 We think that both the reservoirs and the stream will be
4 characteristically rather impoverished. You might call them
5 oligotrophic although that terminology is not really
6 applicable to the river at the moment and we don't foresee any
7 mitigation at the present time.

8 MR. ARMINSKI: Bob.

9 MR. CHLUPACH: I have a question, due more out of
10 ignorance, I guess, than anything. Assuming the dams are
11 constructed, what is the projected effect of, say, the
12 dissolved nitrogen or, say, the gasses in the water on
13 incubating fish or rearing fish? Is it negligible or --
14 The reason I ask is because I don't know myself.

15 MR. STUART: We're not projecting -- and we discussed
16 that in another issue on another day, but dissolved
17 concentrations of nitrogen are expected not to exceed the
18 State statutes downstream from Devil's Canyon; less than
19 110 percent supersaturation. Is that what you're asking?

20 MR. CHLUPACH: Uh-huh.

21 MR. ARMINSKI: Yeah. I guess, in fact, there probably
22 would be an improved condition, because you would -- with
23 the project you wouldn't have those high flows that go
24 through Devil Canyon that causes a supersaturation effect.
25 Furthermore, the dam doesn't spill into a plunge pool as in



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3643

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 many other dams; and the event of a spill is related to the
2 50-year event. Otherwise, all the water, rather than be
3 spilled through a spillway, is released through a cone valve
4 which does not result in a supersaturated condition. Hank?

5 MR. HOSKING: Sailing to the top paragraph on page 3,
6 is there any documentation on the pre-project status of the
7 herbivores and detritivores below the dam river reach? Are
8 there any plans to monitor these populations under project
9 conditions to verify that no adverse impacts will occur?
10 And what is the status on primary productivity information?

11 MR. STUART: I'll start back at your first question.
12 There has been some invertebrate animal collection. It's
13 been rather limited. This area was collected in 1982, I
14 believe, and reported in 1983. There's been another study
15 subsequent to that which we have not received information
16 from as far as I know, not even a draft report from ADF&G.
17 I am not sure exactly what we collected or how many places
18 they collected or how that study was carried out.

19 MR. HOSKING: Okay. I was under the idea -- under the
20 impression that there would be primary productivity? Is
21 there such a thing?

22 MR. STUART: Yeah.

23 MR. GILBERTSON: Let me expand on Tom's answer on the
24 first question. There will be a report coming out in the
25 next month on the insect populations. In addition, there's



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 going to be a one-year -- let's call it a one-year monitoring
2 study in FY '86 to give us estimates of number of organisms
3 per area, or something like that; something that will give
4 us base line information and that we can compare with
5 project measurements. Okay, on the primary productivity,
6 there will be some information available toward the end of
7 this fiscal year on, at a general level, as to what we
8 expect with project conditions to be like for primary
9 productivity; and that's going to focus on a photic zone
10 type of analysis using the assumption that if the substrate's
11 right and if the sun -- and we get light to the substrate,
12 then you're going to get production. Now to follow up on
13 that in this coming field season, we will do some on-site
14 measurements of primary productivity and establish some
15 information for base line for then comparing with project
16 conditions.

17 MR. HOSKING: Okay. If these proposed studies and
18 activities aren't identified in another issue paper, I
19 think it would be appropriate to include them in here.

20 MR. GILBERTSON: We have the same problem here as with
21 the earlier one. When we wrote this position paper we didn't
22 think that we would need to monitor those things. But on
23 further considering the problem, we decided that it would be
24 a good idea to monitor.

25 MR. HOSKING: Okay. Well, along those lines then, on



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 page 9 where it says: No mitigation measures have been
2 proposed, I think this should be expanded along those lines.
3 It's my way of thinking that a mitigation measure would be
4 comparing with what you have now and what you have later on.
5 And the same thing where it says no mitigation measures,
6 on issue F-12 we've looked at before. I think on page 13,
7 it indicates in that paper that nitrogen and phosphorus
8 monitoring will occur along with turbidity sampling. So
9 again, you read one paper where it says this is what's going
10 to be done, and then I read this paper and it says nothing
11 is going to be done.

12 MR. GILBERTSON: Okay. That's the result of, probably,
13 an improper mindset that we have, is we in our minds are
14 separating mitigation from monitoring plan; and really they
15 are.

16 MR. HOSKING: Okay. I see what you're saying.

17 MR. GILBERTSON: We could put that in. There's no
18 problem. We can change our mindset.

19 MR. HOSKING: You won't change mine.

20 MR. GILBERTSON: No, you're probably right. The
21 monitoring ought to go in.

22 MR. THRALL: Put that in writing, please.

23 MR. GILBERTSON: Okay. Which is that, the monitoring
24 ought to go in or the.....

25 MR. ARMINSKI: What else have you got?



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 MR. HOSKING: That's all I've got for this one.

2 MR. ARMINSKI: Dan?

3 MR. ROSENBERG: No. That answers any questions I had.

4 MR. ARMINSKI: Bruce?

5 MR. BEDARD: On page 8, this table 2 where you show
6 grayling per mile, is this the basis of what you estimate
7 the losses to be?

8 MR. MARCHEGIANI: Wait. We're on.....

9 MR. ARMINSKI: That's the next one. We're on 2.6, the
10 nutrient.

11 MR. BEDARD: Oh, you mentioned F-5. I thought we were
12 on F-5.

13 MR. ARMINSKI: No.

14 MR. BEDARD: All right.

15 MR. LATTA: Throw some water on that guy.

16 MR. BEDARD: No, I have no questions.

17 MR. ARMINSKI: Okay. Let's move on to F-5, impoundment
18 effects. It's our position that arctic grayling habitat
19 in tributaries will be inundated by the impoundments and
20 lost and therefore should be mitigated. It lists some
21 mitigation measures here we can discuss. Let's see. Who's
22 going to discuss this one? John?

23 MR. GILBERTSON: First of all, the information that I
24 used in preparing this report is based on information provided
25 by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game through a



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 hydroaquatic study team, and their studies of the impoundment
2 zone, particularly the studies conducted in 1982. In
3 addition, I used the information that is being generated
4 by the need for power people and the reservoir
5 operations' people to get an idea of what was going on, how
6 the reservoir would be operated; and in addition to that
7 some of the information on turbidity contained in the
8 Peratrovich, Nottingham and Drage report; and in the license
9 application; and the information contained in the license
10 application pertaining to the reservoir areas. There are a
11 couple of things that probably should be corrected or
12 discussed in a little bit more detail, and that is: As
13 I understand from, I believe, it was your previous meeting
14 here that the concept or the measure for supplementing the
15 existing rainbow population programs in the Anchorage area,
16 I believe there was some discussion of whether to omit that
17 completely; and we were not clear as to whether or not there
18 was a comprehensive agreement among all of the agencies for
19 that deletion of that consideration, so it is in this
20 particular document at this particular point. And until we
21 get a clear statement, agreement, from all the agencies we
22 will continue to use that as an option; or it's still an
23 option whether we get a clear consensus from all of the
24 agencies on that.

25 MR. ARMINSKI: Bob?



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 MR. CHLUPACH: I can't, of course, say what the
2 Department -- how the Department would prioritize this type
3 of mitigation. I have to give a little background on what
4 I do. I'm the F.R.E.D. area biologist in northern Cook
5 Inlet, so if there's any enhancement programs to be developed
6 up there, I would be the one essentially responsible for
7 that. In talking with Larry Engle, the area sport fish
8 biologist in Palmer, and the sport fish people in Anchorage,
9 they are currently utilizing all the existing lakes that
10 can support a landlocked trout stocking program, or grayling
11 or Coho, program to -- I don't know whether you think that
12 there are other lakes that can be used right now. There
13 are not, because all the lakes are being planted on a
14 priority basis. In other words, there's just no other
15 existing lake between here and Talkeetna. I'm sure there
16 are some that could be stocked, but they're not of the
17 priority of, say, of Kepler-Bradley Lake or Seymore Lake,
18 or something like that in the Big Lake area. So I don't
19 understand, I guess, what the mitigation would be if these
20 things are currently fully utilized.

21 MR. GILBERTSON: Well, if the Department tells us
22 that there aren't places to plant rainbow trout, then we
23 just omit that one. I guess, then, what kind of things do
24 you see as possibilities for mitigating for the impoundment
25 area loss?



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 MR. CHLUPACH: So the questions, then, that you ask is --
2 for instance, let's say, in the case of king salmon on the
3 second page there, the loss of 25 to 75 -- I don't mean
4 to change this in relation to what you're saying just
5 because you want a mitigation answer. What you're
6 essentially coming down and saying is, perhaps, more king
7 salmon in some other drainage of the Susitna River would be
8 a potential mitigation result for the sacrifice of, say,
9 those other fish upstream.

10 MR. GILBERTSON: That's certainly an option.

11 MR. ROSENBERG: Excuse me a second. Yeah, I think two
12 things. One, we did -- the Fish and Game view is to rule
13 out the rainbow propagation as being thing, and I'm rather
14 concerned as to what other agencies have to all agree on
15 this. I mean, I agree there should be agency agreement, but
16 I don't know which ones you are referring to, because as
17 you know we keep -- as you know, we bring it up and we bring
18 it up, and you keep putting it back in. So I think it
19 should just be clarified.

20 MR. GILBERTSON: Well, part of our goal in this process is
21 to satisfy as many people as we possibly can. And Fish and
22 Wildlife service does have a mitigation policy. We're not
23 arguing with the logic of the proposals that you put forth
24 after the mitigation workshop. We think that it's a good
25 idea, too, but we're a little bit uncomfortable about how



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 that fits in to Fish and Wildlife service's mitigation
2 policy. If I remember right, the main two that you proposed
3 were improving access for fishermen to east side tributaries
4 on the Susitna, and looking at some habitat replacement options
5 on the Middle River.

6 MR. ROSENBERG: Exactly. That's what I -- that was my
7 second point to be brought up here, yeah.

8 MR. GILBERTSON: Okay. So, you know, as I tried to
9 say -- I probably didn't do a very good job -- is I tried to
10 say in the last position paper meeting was, you know: We
11 have received your comments and we agree with them. The
12 reason it didn't show up as an option here is we're still --
13 haven't gotten word from any of the other agencies on how
14 they feel about the thing.

15 MR. HOSKING: Okay. Here's a word from Fish and
16 Wildlife Service. We would prefer the development of new
17 habitat, or access to new habitat, along the Middle River;
18 and then provide access for individuals to get in there,
19 this type of thing. So I think that is in line with our
20 mitigation policy, new habitat is developed, or access by
21 the fish to the habitat, and then access for people to
22 utilize it.

23 MR. BIZER: This would be primarily for anadromous fish
24 rather than the resident fish though.

25 MR. HOSKING: No, I think it would be access for



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 people just to the river. But the new habitat, primarily,
2 I think probably for resident fish.

3 MR. ROSENBERG: I think what we're anxious to say, and
4 I think he agrees with us, that it's maybe very difficult to
5 replace in kind the grayling that are lost through the
6 impoundment, so we're suggesting alternatives to that.

7 MR. HOSKING: Perhaps there is some side channel or
8 some side slough or something like this that -- or tributaries
9 where additional access could be provided.

10 MR. GILBERTSON: Okay. One of the things that we're
11 looking at right now for one of our mitigation tasks in
12 FY '86 is to do a survey of the area for potential habitat
13 improvement, looking at some of the tributaries for
14 blockages and, you know, natural blocks to migration and
15 things like that. It would be especially, I guess, where
16 the grayling and rainbow -- it's opening up new habitat to
17 them for spawning and tributary rearing during the open
18 water season.

19 MR. HOSKING: I like the idea you've proposed here on
20 paper on developing borrow sites. I think that's pretty
21 neat, but I'd really like to ask some questions here if you're
22 talking about borrow sites above the dams and so forth; such
23 things as: Are they going to be inundated by high reservoir
24 flows? Are you looking at just ground water sources here?
25 Are you providing channels between the borrow sites and the



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 reservoir itself, this type of thing. And I guess what
2 little bit I've seen about borrow areas I don't know if
3 there are going to be any of them that lend themselves to
4 this type of thing. It would be a clear water system.

5 MR. BIZER: Okay. There are two basic groups of
6 borrow sites that I was referring to in this particular one.
7 One is the borrow sites for the fill for the dam, and I
8 believe there's one immediately downstream of the Watana
9 reservoir in the Tsusena Creek mouth area. And of course,
10 we don't know exactly how that material is going to be
11 removed as yet, but in terms of recontouring it post-project
12 -- or once the construction is finished, it could be in
13 such a way that we can insure that, you know, clear water
14 areas would be available within that area, including a
15 channel.

16 MR. HOSKING: That is a very valid option to my way of
17 thinking, in conjunction with this exploration of traditional
18 habitat. I like that very much.

19 MR. BIZER: The other borrow sites that might be
20 involved might be those that would be located along the
21 access road, if in fact they are needed. There is some
22 question as to whether or not they'll be able to get
23 enough fill from either end for the access road to complete
24 the bed for the road. However, they may need to acquire
25 materials from along the corridor at that point. And those



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 borrow sites could be located or constructed in such a way
2 that they could provide additional habitat for grayling.

3 MR. HOSKING: What you have in mind there is just a
4 put and take type thing?

5 MR. BIZER: Yes.

6 MR. BEDARD: Would this be similar to what is presently
7 -- before you get in to Chitna? Where they put the road
8 right through they created a pretty deep area where they
9 dug out material to build that road, and then the cuts are
10 filled in with water because on the other side was a natural
11 lake. Eventually that side filled up with water and it has
12 grayling in it, good-sized grayling. I've caught grayling
13 and rainbow out of that man-made pond, so to speak.

14 MR. BIZER: That's the kind of thing that we would have
15 in mind.

16 MR. BEDARD: Is that what you're talking about?

17 MR. BIZER: Yes.

18 MR. ARMINSKI: Bob.

19 MR. CHLUPACH: Again, out of ignorance, is the put and
20 take factor when you factor this into the borrow pits, is
21 that factored in on an annual basis per stocking? In
22 other words, once you get the borrow site in there it doesn't
23 do you any good to put one stocking of grayling in there
24 'cause they're not going to propagate themselves in a
25 borrow pit.



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 MR. ARMINSKI: All right. This would be an annual
2 restocking?

3 MR. CHLUPACH: That's what I'm saying. Is that part
4 of the mitigation, is the annual stock of the borrow pit
5 on an annual basis?

6 MR. BEDARD: Well, rainbow would, but I don't know if
7 grayling would.

8 MR. GILBERTSON: Rainbow still need flowing water, too.

9 MR. BEDARD: No, they spawn in Florence Lake, and as
10 far as I know there's no flowing water in there.

11 MR. GILBERTSON: It would be incorporated into the
12 mitigation plan if this option were one that you wanted.
13 Another possibility in developing these borrow sites along
14 the access road that may be a little touchy -- I don't know --
15 But you could associate these things with tributaries if the
16 proper materials were available near a tributary. So, you
17 know, if the agencies wish this sort of thing in the
18 mitigation, you might be able to direct the engineering a
19 little bit in terms of where they build the borrow pits,
20 how they excavate them, and then how they leave them -- is
21 you might be able to design a connection with the tributary
22 and create some -- not just the put and take situation, but
23 maybe create some overwintering habitat in some of the
24 tributaries which, you know, which would be of real value in
25 that area, looking at winter conditions in the tributaries.



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 MR. BIZER: I think in terms of the annual stocking,
2 too, I think it would depend a little bit on, first of all,
3 whether or not the fish that were stocked in any given year
4 were able to survive the winter. Okay? So that you'd
5 probably want to structure the pond to have sufficient depth
6 so that it wouldn't freeze to the bottom, so you could have
7 carry-over from year to year. And secondly, you'd want to
8 sort of keep an eye -- keep tabs on how many fish were
9 actually taken, what the harvest pressure really is on it.
10 So it may be, you know -- you may be stocking, you know,
11 with fry or fingerlings if we get sufficient numbers of them,
12 but then those might not become catchable or desirable --
13 desirable until they are maybe, you know, eight, 10, 12
14 inches long. And so you'd want to provide sufficient depth
15 and so forth to provide for overwintering. And again, you'd
16 be able to monitor the populations to the point where if
17 there's sufficient fishing pressure to them, we could
18 replace. We may not need it every year. It may be a
19 bi-annual kind of thing.

20 MR. THRALL: I think the important thing here is the
21 concept because there's a lot of detail that cannot be
22 worked out until people actually go in and sample borrow
23 pit sites. Until contractor develops his plan to remove
24 borrow, you don't know exactly how deep these sites are
25 going to be or exactly what their location is going to be.



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 But the concept, I think, is a valid one.

2 MR. ARMINSKI: Bob, please.

3 MR. CHLUPACH: Yeah. Something else that, perhaps,
4 should be incorporated in the mitigation end of it is: I
5 know from experience that in developing -- say, for instance,
6 in transporting fish from one area to another you have to
7 go through a whole series of different planning processes,
8 different transport permit approvals, and so forth and so
9 on, just for disease screening purposes and to keep in
10 check the transferring of diseases that are inherent in fish
11 from one watershed to another. Perhaps something should be
12 built into the mitigation process that a brood be in part
13 developed, say, three years before the dam goes in so that
14 you're already sitting there ready to go when the dam is
15 finished; because what I'm saying is: Maybe after the disease
16 screening process is all said and done on a particular brood
17 source, perhaps it doesn't lie in your drainage, and in fact
18 it does have a virus or a bacteria that someone doesn't want
19 transferred, then you're left without a brood. What I am
20 saying is develop the potential brood from the existing
21 stocks that are already there to avoid a potential problem
22 after the dam is in.

23 MR. ARMINSKI: Yeah. Okay.

24 MR. BEDARD: I want to bring up something through the
25 mitigation. The Kepler-Bradley Lake area was recently -- a



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 lot of that was just recently acquired by the State, an
2 additional pressure that is going to be put on that area.
3 I would rather see that be mitigated rather than the
4 Anchorage lakes and ponds. I've fished that area and there's
5 some sizeable rainbow in there now. There's grayling in
6 Vic -- not Victor, but Irene Lake, and there's silver
7 salmon in Victor Lake, and Long Lake also has, really,
8 trophy size rainbow. I've caught them 25 inches out of there.
9 What I would like to see, because I know that's going to be
10 opened up because the State now owns it, is prior to that
11 any mitigation. That would be a prime area. It's still kind
12 of a woodsy-type atmosphere, yet close to populations, and
13 that's more attractive than any site that's close by in
14 access. And I see a big pressure coming on there. If we
15 don't have a suitable stocking program, that's going to be
16 diminished.

17 MR. ARMINSKI: Any other comments?

18 MR. BEDARD: Oh, yeah. Again, on this table 2, page 8,
19 this grayling per mile bit, is that the basis for loss of
20 fish or how do they come up with that? I'm kind of dumb on
21 this, the kind of reasons where it makes any sense to me.
22 Trout know no boundaries on any tributary. They don't
23 necessarily spawn in any particular area. And it's just
24 saying that the first mile-and-a-half of Tsusena Creek is
25 impacted by 440 fish per mile. How do they determine that?



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 I'm just curious. I know that the Tsusena is quite a
2 distance and those fish might come down and then be counted
3 in that area at that time, but I'm not quite sure how they
4 determine it. Did they take a count of fish and estimate so
5 much per mile, and that's how much is going to be allotted?

6 MR. BIZER: Okay. The basic method for determining
7 the population levels in these things is a marked release
8 method -- or mark recapture. And what they, basically --
9 the ADF&G basically delineated a specific reach within each
10 of these drainages as an index for the remainder -- an index
11 area for the remainder of the river. And based on their
12 mark recapture estimates, they had an estimate of densities
13 per mile; and this is based on during the summer period.

14 MR. BEDARD: The reason I'm asking that is: If that's
15 the case, once the areas that are lost are impounded, what is
16 the additional capacity that the remaining portion of that
17 tributary can handle an additional fish per mile? So that
18 you -- so that the loss may not be as great as what you're
19 showing.

20 MR. BIZER: Okay. There's several aspects to your
21 question. A basic assumption of these estimates per mile
22 is that -- or the population estimates -- is that the
23 entire reach of these tributaries are at capacity.

24 MR. BEDARD: Yeah, that's.....

25 MR. BIZER: Okay. That's a basic assumption. Whether



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 in fact that is true or not, there's really -- it's very
2 difficult to try to estimate what the capacity is and where
3 the population is relative to that capacity.

4 MR. BEDARD: Don't we have, of all the streams
5 throughout Alaska -- don't we have any kind of data that
6 could, through a model or something, tell us what is the
7 capacity of a certain size stream based on the length of
8 the stem?

9 MR. BIZER: I think you'd find it very difficult to
10 find somebody that would go out on a limb and say that.

11 MR. BEDARD: Okay. The reason why I'm saying that is:
12 How can someone determine that's going to be the loss of the
13 fish if they don't have that kind of information on how
14 much a stream can actually handle?

15 MR. THRALL: I think the thing here, Bruce, is that
16 this is a reasonable way -- it probably gives you, you know,
17 a conservative estimate of the loss.

18 MR. BEDARD: Okay.

19 MR. THRALL: And I think the time and effort spent to
20 maybe refine that could just as well be spent in refining a
21 mitigation and.....

22 MR. BEDARD: Okay. I'll buy that.

23 MR. THRALL:replace the fish.

24 MR. BEDARD: I'm just asking because it didn't make
25 much sense to me.



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 MR. THRALL: It's a very difficult thing. And you're
2 dealing with an open system, not a closed system, so you
3 kind of have to limit what you can really do.

4 MR. BEDARD: Well, on the lake trout on page 11, it
5 says: A small population of lake trout will be lost at
6 Sally Lake. And we are concerned with that, because Sally
7 Lake is entirely on our land. Is there any way of mitigating
8 lake trout population in a similar lake like at Fog Lake?
9 I believe one or two of those lakes could handle lake trout,
10 but I don't know if there's -- I know there's lake trout in
11 some of the Fog Lakes, but I don't know if there's lake trout
12 in all five of them. And maybe one of those lakes could
13 handle an additional population of lake trout as an offset
14 to Sally Lake; I don't know. I'm just bringing that up.

15 MR. ROSENBERG: While we're on that one, could I just
16 make one comment on that? It says: A small population of
17 lake trout was identified in Sally Lake. And then it says:
18 Due to insufficient recaptures of marked fish, the population
19 size could not be estimated. And I guess I would assume --
20 maybe there's more to this than what it reads -- but if you
21 go out and you mark a bunch of fish, your recaptures are
22 very low relative to the numbers of fish you mark, wouldn't
23 that indicate that there's, perhaps, a high population -- or
24 a large population. Excuse me.

25 MR. BIZER: If there were a large population in this



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 lake, you'd expect first of all to catch a larger number of
2 fish in a confined system such as Sally Lake.

3 MR. ROSENBERG: It doesn't say that.

4 MR. THRALL: I think it's not that there were a lot of
5 fish marked and then very few recaptured, I think it was
6 very few captured to even mark in the first place.

7 MR. ROSENBERG: Okay. That's what I wanted to know.

8 MR. BIZER: Yeah, that's basically right. I think,
9 basically, a general rule of thumb for population estimates
10 is that you should get something like five percent of your
11 recapture should be marked, or your second collection, to
12 get a reliable estimate. And that, in fact, as I recall
13 right offhand -- that, in fact, was achieved. However,
14 they only caught, I think it was, 30 fish total; and some
15 of those they were unable to release back as marked fish
16 because they used -- in some cases, I think they used gill
17 nets on it.

18 MR. ROSENBERG: Okay. Maybe I was just reading --
19 sort of reading it wrong, but I just wasn't sure.

20 MR. BIZER: It may be stated just a little bit -- I
21 can understand where you might be -- the statement might be
22 a little bit misleading.

23 MR. BEDARD: On page 18 I had a question there on dolly
24 varden. It says -- oh, yeah. My question was in regards
25 to why are the fish dwarfed up there? Is it because of their



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 present environment, the streams being very low or small?

2 MR. BIZER: You know, there are several factors that
3 go into that. One of them is it's cold, just the habitat
4 itself is such that -- The other thing is that Morrow, on
5 several studies that have been conducted and are referred to
6 by Morrow, indicates that there tends to be two strains of
7 dolly varden and one is a dwarf strain.

8 MR. BEDARD: Similar to eastern brook trout?

9 MR. BIZER: Yeah, right.

10 MR. BEDARD: The reason why I was asking is historically
11 in the Kinegak (ph) River in the State of Maine when they
12 built the dams back in the mid-1800's, they found that the
13 eastern brook trout got larger behind the impoundment versus
14 the smaller ones below the impoundment.

15 MR. BIZER: Uh-huh.

16 MR. BEDARD: And I'm wondering if the same type of
17 environment might occur on this that would create a
18 recreational fishing potential? It's kind of opposite to
19 what they're saying here that not be likely that a significant
20 sport fish would be developed in a reservoir. I disagree
21 with that myself. My own experience of four major dams on
22 the Kinegak (ph) River, behind the impoundment was the best
23 fishing, especially for trophy size fish. And over a 100
24 years of dams in that area have not affected the fish
25 downriver or upriver, including the winter flows and ice



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3643

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 of six feet.

2 MR. BIZER: I'd like to ask you a question about this
3 Maine system there. Is that a glacially fed system?

4 MR. BEDARD: No, but it has a lot of siltation. It's
5 fed from the Mt. Katadin (ph) area which -- glacial silt was
6 there at one time but the glaciers have all melted versus
7 like it's still melting in Washington State.

8 MR. BIZER: Uh-huh.

9 MR. BEDARD: So there's still glacial silt that feeds
10 the river, but with the damming the silt kind of almost
11 went away. The river got cleaner.

12 MR. BIZER: Much of this is the projection of the loss
13 of the recreational fisheries based on the experience in
14 glacially fed lakes here in Alaska. For example, Tustemena
15 Lake is a glacially fed lake that remains turbid throughout
16 the year; and the sport fishing in Tustemena is not
17 significant. Similarly with Eklutna reservoir. It is a
18 glacially fed, and again there is not a significant fishery
19 in it. That's not to say that there aren't fish in there.
20 It's just that it's not sport fishery.

21 MR. ARMINSKI: Okay. Any other comments?

22 MR. ROSENBERG: Just a couple brief ones, I hope.

23 MR. ARMINSKI: Okay.

24 MR. ROSENBERG: Just going back to the borrow pit idea.
25 Generally, the positive aspects of the borrow sites that we



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3643

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 see -- and I don't know if this would be possible or not --
2 and this would be using borrow sites as a recreational
3 fishery for construction workers. I don't know if the timing
4 would be in the proper sequence, but that can be possible.
5 That seems like a way to alleviate some of the fishing
6 pressures on the tributaries and lakes in the project area,
7 by directing that fishery to, perhaps, those borrow sites.

8 MR. THRALL: I think we've just the other day been
9 discussing this within the terms of, maybe, some put and
10 take fisheries in some of the lakes right near the
11 construction; lakes that right now may have very little in
12 the way of fisheries resources. But you can do some put
13 and take fishery, stocking, and you could keep a lot of the
14 construction work force happy; you know, go out and catch
15 some rainbow or something. Plus the concept we were kicking
16 around is very similar to what you're just saying.

17 MR. ROSENBERG: Okay.

18 MR. BIZER: I'd like to summarize, if nobody has any
19 further questions.....

20 MR. ROSENBERG: Just.....

21 MR. BIZER: Okay.

22 MR. ROSENBERG: Well, one more thing on the statement on
23 the second page of the executive summary on the end of the
24 third paragraph. Since only 25 to 75 salmon have been
25 observed in this reach in each study year, the loss of these



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 spawning areas is not considered significant. And I think
2 a case can be made, and I think we are making a case, the
3 loss of 25 to 75 king salmon is worthy of a little more
4 consideration. It may have an effect on the returning king
5 salmon and the recreational fishery. Bob, do you want to
6 talk about this some more?

7 MR. CHLUPACH: Yeah, I'm thinking -- let's take, for
8 example, the 25 to 75 king salmon doesn't seem like too
9 many fish, but there are several drainages on the Susitna
10 River that sometimes don't even get 25 fish into them. It's
11 very, very important. But all of these fish amalgamated
12 into one compose an entire fishery all the way from a
13 commercial fishery to a subsistence fishery to a sport
14 fishery and a variety of different user groups. But if we
15 take 25 king salmon, and for theoretical purposes 8,000 eggs
16 per female, that's in the vicinity of 200,000 eggs. And
17 you run through all of the little survival regimes what
18 you're talking about at a minimum is 200 king salmon adults
19 returning to the Susitna drainage. Fifty percent of that
20 will probably be harvested by the commercial fishery.
21 Another 100 fish will be entering the Susitna drainage. All
22 those fish are going to pass by the Alexander Creek, Deska,
23 Willow Creek, Montana Creek, all the way on up. So by the
24 time it gets up there you can very easily see that, say,
25 25 fish as spawners that means 75 fish were caught. And I



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3643

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 think recent creel census, or past creel census by sport
2 fish division, all along the Susitna River will indicate
3 that the number of man hours spent and the amount of money
4 spent on just catching one king salmon -- and I admit it's
5 not a trophy fish in the Susitna River -- the number of
6 fish and the amount of money spent in just catching that one
7 king salmon is a vast number of dollars; and that trend is
8 not going to decrease. And with that in mind, since that
9 trend is not going to decrease, I just can't -- I don't
10 understand how we can rationalize 25 to 75 king salmon adults
11 away.

12 MR. BEDARD: I was under the understanding that 25 to 75
13 fish was not just kings; there was a combination of salmon.
14 Am I wrong?

15 MR. ARMINSKI: John?

16 MR. BIZER: This should be kings. This is evidence of
17 kings.

18 MR. BEDARD: Go up the canyon?

19 MR. BIZER: Well, to various points up the canyon.
20 The majority of these fish probably -- oh, 50 percent or
21 more -- have been observed at the mouths of Cheechako Creek
22 and what is now referred to as Chinook Creek, which are
23 immediately upstream of the Devil Canyon dam site.

24 MR. BEDARD: Were they actually spawning there?

25 MR. BIZER: There were, I think, maybe four or five



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 spawning pairs at each site. Some of these numbers include
2 some that were seen at Devil Creek and as far up as Fog
3 Creek, but I think the numbers there were on the order of
4 two or three individuals, and in one case it was just one
5 individual, which is kind of difficult for it to spawn.
6 The statement of considering it not significant is really
7 in relevance to the Portage Creek fishery -- or the escapement
8 into Portage Creek which is estimated at approximately 1,000
9 fish. So relative to that number, the 25 to 75 fish of
10 which only a portion of them are actually able to spawn
11 were -- we considered it not that significant. In your case,
12 Bob, of the multiplication factor, I think one thing -- I
13 don't know if you took into consideration that this was
14 20 -- used the entire 25 to 75 fish. If so, 50 percent of
15 them were females and so.....

16 MR. CHLUPACH: But I did use the lower figure, too.

17 MR. BIZER: Okay.

18 MR. ROSENBERG: One more brief comment. This is just
19 to reiterate a point that we've been making in the past.
20 This has to be considered in the light of accumulative
21 impacts, also; and so that's just one of the arguments that
22 -- one of the problems that we've had with this position
23 paper process in general, and it's not considered here in
24 that light. It needs to be.

25 MR. ARMINSKI: Bruce?



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING

1 MR. BEDARD: Yeah. I'm just wondering: In terms of
2 being able, you know, to analyze impacts for laymen, would
3 it be better to talk in terms of number of pairs sighted
4 rather than number of fish? It makes more sense to me if I
5 was trying to evaluate like he was doing the number of eggs
6 that would possibly be lost if an impoundment took place.
7 If I saw 75 fish, I don't know if it's male or female.

8 MR. BIZER: Okay. Just a reference in there may be to
9 say what proportion is male, or something like that -- or
10 what proportion is female.

11 MR. BEDARD: Or something that refers to it so that
12 someone can sit down, like a layman, and make some kind of
13 quick analysis where you're making sense out of it.

14 MR. BIZER: Okay. We can add a little parenthetical
15 statement in there.

16 MR. ARMINSKI: Okay. Anything else? Can we call it
17 quits? Okay, great. Now, we'll go through the last two
18 agendi. When's the next meeting, Jack?

19 MR. ROBINSON: April the 5th.

20 * * * * *
21 END OF PROCEEDINGS
22 * * * * *



340 G STREET, SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
(907) 274-3645

AKULAW COURT REPORTING