

ALASKA POWER AUTHORITY
SUSITNA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT
SETTLEMENT PROCESS

POSITION PAPER DISCUSSION MEETING #4

April 5, 1985

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

Old Business: Deferred

New Business: Position Papers S-2, F-6, F-8, C-1, C-2, W-2, W-3, W-4

A T T E N D E E S

Tom Arminski, APA
Bruce Bedard, CIRI Villages
Pam Bergmann, HE
Judy Bittner, SHPO
Randy Fairbanks, HE
Richard Fleming, APA
Larry Gilbertson, HE
Chris Godfrey, EPA
Hank Hosking, FWS
Carolyn Jones, AK Atty. Gen.
Joel Klein, HE
Leroy Latta, ADNR
Jeff Lowenfels, BHB
Eric Marchegiani, APA

Dallas Owens, HE
Jerry Roach, ADOTPF
Jack Robinson, HE
Dan Rosenberg, ADF&G
Phil Scordelis, HE
Dean Shinn, Advisory Council
Brad Smith, NMFS
Gary Stackhouse, FWS
Gail Thompson, Earth
Technology Corp.
Jim Thrall, HE
Sharon Vaissiere, HE
Beth Walton, BLM
Jim Wolfe, FMAA

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

5 POSITION PAPER DISCUSSION MEETING #4
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

8:30 a.m.
April 5, 1985
Northern Lights Room
Northern Lights Inn
Anchorage, Alaska

* * * * *

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 8th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

ALASKA POWER AUTHORITY

334 WEST 5th AVENUE - ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501

Phone: (907) 277-7841
(907) 276-0001

April 11, 1985
Susitna File No. 1.8.1/6.18.8.4/1.17.4.2

Mr. Dan Rosenberg
Alaska Department of Fish & Game
333 Raspberry Road
Anchorage, Alaska 99502

Subject: Susitna Hydroelectric Project
Document Transmittal

Dear Mr. Rosenberg:

Please find enclosed for your use one copy of the Fourth Position Paper Discussion Meeting Transcript.

Sincerely,



For James B. Dischinger
Project Manager
Susitna Hydroelectric Project

csl

Enc: as noted

cc w/o Enc:

T. Arminski, Power Authority
J. Drennan, PMS (DC)
C. Curtis, VFSC&L (DC)
J. Lowenfels, BHBP&A
W. Larson, HE

ALASKA DEPT. OF
FISH & GAME

APR 18 1985

HABITAT
REGIONAL OFFICE

P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2 MR. ARMINSKI: This is position paper meeting
3 number 4. I'm going -- I'm not going to go through the typical
4 opening remarks, I think we've all sat through those things
5 enough times. What I'd like to do is have -- Dr. Fleming wants
6 to say a few words about the staging with respect to the FERC
7 licensing process, and then Jeff wants to talk for a few minutes
8 about how this all fits into mitigation planning, so, Richard,
9 why don't you go ahead?

10 DR. FLEMING: Well, if you haven't heard
11 yet, it's been on the radio and it'll probably be in the paper,
12 we got a letter from FERC, oh, Monday or Tuesday. And the typi-
13 cal kind of FERC letter, it laid out a procedural tool as far
14 as they were concerned. It said that the flow regimes were a
15 revision to the application and a surprise, although they got
16 the first information in November. It said that the most recent
17 information we'd supplied them had changed the on-line date to
18 1996 instead of 1993. Of course, every time they delay the license
19 there's a comparable delay in the on-line date, but I guess pro-
20 cedurally, at least, it's a surprise. And finally they said we
21 had informed them that we were considering staging but had not
22 made a decision yet whether we were or were not going to proceed
23 with that. What we had told them was that we had recommended
24 to the Board of Directors that we investigate staging more fully
25 and if we -- when we had better cost and design information, make

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 a decision about whether to refine or revise the license. So
2 their letter set these three situations and then said, you know,
3 their resources were essentially thin enough that they could not
4 afford to initiate some analysis and then at some time later in
5 the future go back and go over it again. And they requested us
6 to inform them within about 30 days as to whether we were going
7 to fish or cut bait, what we intended to do. So I guess next
8 week we'll have to draft a letter to Quinten Edson saying what
9 sort of process we think we're involving -- we're involved with.

10 I think they wanted information on two things. One was
11 kind of procedurally how we thought we were going to deal with
12 it in terms of when the Board of Directors might take an action
13 and what might follow from that. And the other thing I think
14 they're looking for is some coaching with respect to what parts
15 of the analysis in the FEIS would remain valid with the staging,
16 if staging was incorporated, and what parts of the analysis might
17 have to be modified or updated if we went with staging, because
18 they would like to continue -- I would read into the letter that
19 they would like to kind of continue doing what is going to remain
20 valid, but they have not got the resources to undertake any ana-
21 lysis which may subsequently become invalid.

22 So that's the most recent news from FERC. We don't view
23 it with alarm. We anticipated something like this happening,
24 and it's a goad from them trying to get us to clarify what's going
25 on, which we'll try and do. We anticipate going to the next Board

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 of Directors' meetings with the information that has been worked
2 up in the last couple of months, seeking from the Board direction
3 to proceed or to not proceed with the staging. And then at that
4 time we can tell FERC more explicitly what we're going to do,
5 and hopefully work out some path with FERC in terms of how we
6 get it all accomplished.

7 MR. ARMINSKI: Any questions?

8 MR. SMITH: When's that next Board meeting
9 going to be?

10 DR. FLEMING: There was a Board meeting
11 scheduled for the 8th or 9th or something --

12 MR. ARMINSKI: 9th. It's been cancelled.

13 DR. FLEMING: -- and it's been cancelled
14 and I think it's going to be like the 2nd or 3rd of May now that
15 they're talking about. There was some strategizing in terms of
16 how early they could do it in terms of a number of different
17 agenda items being brought up, and I think they were looking to
18 the end of that week that starts on April 30th.

19 MR. SMITH: Will the Board have your staff
20 analysis of the situation before that meeting? Is it likely
21 they're going to act at that time or do you think that they'll
22 -- they'll just receive your presentation?

23 DR. FLEMING: Well, the protocol that we
24 usually follow is that material that's going to be discussed at
25 the Board meeting is supplied in the Board packet a week earlier,

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 which allows the Board members and their staff to review it. So
2 it would be my expectation that the Board packet would outline
3 where the analysis stood and what -- whether it confirmed the
4 earlier information that we provided them. And also we'll have
5 to make some recommendations in terms of how we proceed proce-
6 durally. And I would expect that they would take some action
7 at that meeting. Basically we see a several step process. The
8 next action -- if they wish to proceed with staging, would be
9 a decision directing us to proceed to develop the additional ana-
10 lysis that's needed and to prepare the material that would be
11 used to modify the license application. And so then we'd start
12 doing that, that would take -- some of the stuff could come out
13 fairly quickly, some of the technical analysis, and some of the
14 other material might take longer. And then there would probably
15 be another formal occasion some months later which would be a
16 decision to submit revisions to the license.

17 But it's kind of a chicken and an egg process. We're
18 trying to find out from FERC how they would deal with it, and
19 FERC's trying to find out what we're doing, and, you know, we're
20 both kind of maneuvering.

21 MR. ARMINSKI: Okay, Jeff, you want to talk
22 about the mitigation plan?

23 MR. LOWENFELS: Yes. At our last meeting
24 and again in a couple of communications that we've gotten, and
25 I don't know if the communications that come to us with comments

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 on these position papers are also sent to you people, we got one
2 from Fish & Game, I know, and it wasn't clear to me whether those
3 comments had been passed on to you people, but in any case there
4 seems to be an underlying confusion about the relationship between
5 these position paper meetings, the position papers themselves
6 and what we hope to be the ultimate mitigation and monitoring
7 plans. I think all of us pretty much agree that among the agree-
8 ments that we will have to put together will be an agreement on
9 a mitigation plan or on a mitigation -- well, on a mitigation
10 plan. I think we'll also need an agreement on a monitoring plan,
11 probably an agreement on an avoidance plan, in some instances.
12 But in any case, there's been a lot of question as to how this
13 process which leads up to those agreements relates to mitigation
14 plans and monitoring plans that people see on the Harza Ebasco
15 task list. And I think the simplest way to approach it is to
16 suggest to you that what we're doing today and what we've been
17 doing in the past meetings and what these papers are all about
18 is the following:

19 First, if you took the mitigation measures that are sug-
20 gested in this -- in these papers, you would -- and separated
21 them into the various categories, terrestrial, aquatic, social
22 sciences, you would end up with what we would perceive today to
23 be an executive summary of what our proposed mitigation plan is
24 going to be for that particular subject. That's if we don't get
25 any comments from you, that's if you don't tell us we're wrong,

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 8th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 that's if you don't react to us in a funny fashion. So what we're
2 doing today is adding your comments into that process. And that's
3 the relationship.

4 I think you'll all remember that sometime around February
5 when the Power Authority sent the revised flow regime E-IV to
6 FERC and didn't sit down with the people in this room, we got
7 a tremendous amount of complaints. And we got a lot of screaming
8 and yelling that we were avoiding you people, that we weren't
9 getting your input, et cetera, et cetera. We're trying to avoid
10 doing that. And we find ourselves in somewhat of a peculiar posi-
11 tion because we're -- we perceive a little bit -- We're not that
12 sensitive, but we perceive a little bit of uneasiness on your
13 part in participating in this process, and yet we feel that if
14 we don't participate -- if we don't go through this process, you
15 know, we're back where we were when we issued that paper in E-IV.
16 Not a big thing, but I think the relationship has to be under-
17 stood. What we're doing today, what we're going to be doing at
18 the other meetings is adding onto or changing what we perceive
19 today to be a proper mitigation procedure or proper mitigation
20 plan. Those plans that are being put together by the Harza task
21 leaders, right now some of them are in draft form, some of them
22 people have seen, some of them will be in draft form in the next
23 couple or four or five months, some of them won't be out for ano-
24 ther year, whatever. Their relationship to these meetings depends
25 on what the particular document leader is doing with that. But

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 8th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 MR. LOWENFELS: Yes, let's back up just for
2 a second. You're right, when we sit down and have an agreement
3 that we can take to FERC, I think it'll be -- it'll be no more
4 general than these are. Let's start there. How they're specific
5 they're going to be depends a lot upon the individual issue. I
6 think the individual plan, whether we're talking about a monitor-
7 ing plan versus a mitigation plan, or an avoidance plan, I think
8 we can be pretty specific with some things, "we will not go into
9 this area" is about as specific as you can be. But I don't think
10 -- and it's my own thought and I really don't know and it's some-
11 thing we'll have to talk about among ourselves, I don't think
12 it's going to be as specific as on the Jade Creek mineral lick.
13 Today we're saying we're going to clear 2½ acres. I think you
14 might want to know which 2½ acres are going to be cleared, and
15 I don't think they'll be that specific. Correct me if I'm wrong,
16 correct me if you think they need to be that specific, but I sug-
17 gest that having looked at the existing FERC conditions on
18 licenses, they are grossly underspecific. Ours will be much more
19 specific because they'll be at least as full as these. But I'm
20 not even sure FERC will accept that as a -- as license conditions
21 -- as a license condition package. They are uniformly vague with
22 their specifics. I mean, the flow they may set, but, you know,
23 when they talk about monitoring, they talk about just setting
24 up a team with three biologists. So I don't -- I really don't
25 know, but --

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 MR. ARMINSKI: Yes, well, I think we can
2 -- we can get specific as we want, as we're comfortable with.
3 And, you know, I think Jeff said earlier if you took all the miti-
4 gation measures out of these and put them all together, it'd sort
5 of be an executive summary of the mitigation plan. And so I see
6 the mitigation plan as being a lot more specific than the measures
7 outlined in here where we would, if you can agree on it and we're
8 comfortable setting out which 2½ acres and scheduled, you know,
9 it -- I'm not sure that you want to be real specific, or we want
10 to leave ourselves some leeway in case things don't work so that
11 we don't have to go back and amend the licenses, you know, or
12 whatever. But --

13 DR. FLEMING: Let me observe one thing that
14 I don't think it can be. And that is the project approval process
15 which the Board of Directors has specifically says we cannot get
16 into design activities until there are power sales agreements.
17 And so we are really skirting the edge, and certainly what you
18 see as being your druthers, you know, in the best of all possible
19 worlds would be the layout and plans for everything we're going
20 to do. And the sort of thing we get cross examined all the time
21 about is, is this design activity that you're doing. And if we
22 can say, no, it's planning activity, or it's necessary for
23 licensing, we can generally proceed with it. But our budgets
24 are going to be constrained, and one of the constraints is that
25 we are not supposed to do a lot of design activity. And so we

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 really hope that we can carry things to the point in planning
2 where everybody understands what's going on with the understanding
3 that when design activities are initiated there's a lot of design
4 activity in the environmental program, and that's the period we
5 would see a lot of that activity conducted. The design activities
6 will stretch over, what, three years, two years, or something,
7 so it's not going to be a flash in the pan.

8 MR. LOWENFELS: I think you also have to
9 remember that resource agencies in particular -- this is a license
10 You know, we still have to come to you and get approval for our
11 culvert crossings, you know, our -- our whatever. So this is
12 also just a part of the whole process. And I think that even
13 though we're not supposed to be doing design work on the project,
14 that what we are all doing here is obviously influencing the
15 designers. And I think it's a pretty good place to be.

16 MR. SMITH: I have a little trouble with
17 giving the impression that the FERC license is a living document.
18 My experience has been it's just the opposite. Once those things
19 are set down, you know, somebody's going to look at it 10 years
20 down the road and say "Oh, gee, look what we're supposed to be
21 doing". And that's a problem for us. We've talked about a number
22 of vehicles we could -- memorandums of agreement or specific
23 license conditions or what have you. I guess maybe once we're
24 past talking and reconciling the issues here then we'll decide
25 on how that's going to be done.

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 DR. FLEMING: Well, one thing that's -- we've
2 just had laid on us, which you might not be familiar with, is
3 a -- we got, you know, about that much computer print-out from
4 FFRC, and they said, our -- our license tracking system which
5 we are just putting into operation identifies these stipulations
6 and these things you're supposed to do and you'll notice that
7 this one, this one and this one are in default and that these
8 seem to be taken care of. And in the past, as you may be aware,
9 they've sometimes been rather vague about how they kept track
10 of license stipulations of conditions. It seems that the field
11 offices now are going to have this system which is going to have
12 very explicit tracking and reporting requirements so that -- My
13 experience with licenses is that the license may in fact be vague
14 and it says the applicant and the resource agencies shall work
15 out an arrangement within the next period of time, which is --
16 which is kind of vague, but then that -- you actually have to
17 submit that memorandum of agreement or whatever you're working
18 up, and it varies case by case. The license will probably include
19 provision flow regimes, it would probably say -- my guess is it's
20 going to say "work out how you're going to do the moose mitigation
21 in the next year" or something, depending upon how critical they
22 see it and how far along the process is. But there will be more
23 effective -- hopefully -- monitoring than there has been in the
24 past.

25 MR. THRALL: Brad, from my point of view,

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8691

1 I guess, just for clarification, I think part of -- part of the
2 confusion, or what I perceive as confusion here is that there's
3 some interpretation of this -- of the agencies' desire for speci-
4 ficity in the mitigation plan. The interpretation of what the
5 agencies would like to see is a very -- Let's take an example
6 of a slough modification. We'd like to see a plan that specifies,
7 you know, at slough whatever we will, you know, cut down so many
8 feet and we will, you know, add a -- pipe in some water and put
9 in a berm "X" feet high and so on and so forth. And the feeling
10 is that in fact if we came up -- my feeling is if we came up with
11 something that specific you might then decide that that's not
12 really what you want because it sort of locks everybody into doing
13 one thing and then whether or not it works, you know, the Power
14 Authority could just say "Well, look, that was what we said we'd
15 do, we did it, and now we're done". There's some sort of a deli-
16 cate balance we've got to have between giving you enough specifi-
17 city that you feel comfortable but at the same time allowing every-
18 body leeway so that as things work or don't work -- we all recog-
19 nize that you predict impacts as best you can, and you plan to
20 mitigate them as best you can, but then as the actual project
21 goes in place things are going to change. And I think what we
22 need to do, and maybe this is something that's best done, you
23 know, at other than this meeting or maybe, you know, just in
24 casual conversations, is get a feel for, you know, exactly what
25 are we really talking about in terms of specificity, what would

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 8th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 you really like to see, would you like to see that sort of a level
2 of specificity, which is really in my -- in my way of thinking
3 sort of a design, a mitigation plan design.

4 MR. SMITH: No, I agree 100% with you, and
5 I didn't want to have that come across as a complaint about the
6 lack of specifics in the settlement papers, just to show the
7 linkage between a settlement and wherever that is --

8 MR. THRALL: Okay, so you're -- your only
9 concern is how the process -- where we -- how we will get into
10 that, whatever the right level of specificity is. So you're more
11 concerned with the process?

12 MR. SMITH: Sure, people above me have been
13 -- you know, one question that repeatedly comes back is "well,
14 you know, what are these, what are the settlements?" And I'm
15 trying to impress upon them how -- how that detail is going to
16 fit into the settlement process, and why it isn't necessarily
17 included in these issue papers.

18 MR. MARCHEGIANI: I think, Brad, maybe the
19 real answer to the whole thing is that the issue papers are, I
20 guess, an instrument to get to where you want to go. And what
21 we're doing is we're providing, like Jeff was saying, some general
22 ideas of what the situations are. The FERC specifications will
23 be somewhat general unto themselves, which I think will give us
24 the flexibility. The specifics that I think you're looking for
25 may be held in these technical sessions that we can iron out.

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 But I think the bottom line is is that you want to be sure that
2 you're going to get a certain amount of mitigation, and there
3 is some specificity to it. And what you may find the best way
4 to do that, and I think the tool, the instrument, to get there
5 is that through these specifications that we have in the license
6 and in the issue papers is to reference something like the aquatic
7 mitigation plan, that we agree with the aquatic mitigation plan
8 and that's what's going to be implemented. Okay, then within
9 that mitigation plan you'll end up reviewing it and you'll be
10 able to provide comments in a technical forum and we'll be able
11 to modify and adjust that. And that will provide what you're
12 talking about as far as specifics. I think that's the instrument
13 and the route to go. Like Jeff says, the terms and conditions
14 a lot of times are not that specific, the papers are not real
15 specific. I mean, there's certain parts of them that are. But
16 I think that would be the easiest way to do it. And then as we're
17 working with that mitigation document, we can modify it.

18 MR. ARMINSKI: Okay, let's get off of this
19 and go on. We don't have any papers to discuss under old business,
20 but Jack Robinson's going to say a few words on how we plan to
21 handle this in the future. Jack?

22 MR. ROBINSON: I think that it would be in
23 the interest of all that as we go through the process -- well,
24 right now we're in the part of the process where we're principally
25 involved in taking in the -- taking a look at the first round

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 of papers. The -- and discussing them. And as you all know,
2 we've received comments from you in these meetings and we've also
3 received some written comments from some of the parties involved
4 in the settlement process. What we would suggest as a way to
5 work into the next step is to take the comments that you have
6 sent to the Power Authority and expressed here in these meetings
7 and work them into the revisions of the papers, the revised papers,
8 and then, once those papers have been revised reflecting the com-
9 ments that have been offered, then send them to you with a letter
10 from the Power Authority that says, "Here are revised papers num-
11 bers so and so, so and so and so and so", and that set a meeting
12 date at which those revisions would be -- would be discussed.
13 And we would like to distribute those revised papers to all the
14 parties on our distribution list, not all of whom can always come
15 to these meetings, so that all the people that we have invited
16 to these initials meetings that we're now at would also have the
17 opportunity to see the revisions that have occurred to the papers
18 as a result of this forum that we're having here. And as we indi-
19 cated before at one of the previous meetings, we will show in
20 each one of the revised papers by a mark in the margin where the
21 revisions have been made in the papers so that you can pick up
22 the paper, look at it and say, "Oh, yeah, this paragraph's been
23 revised". And it will be easily then comparable with the paper
24 that was originally discussed so it'll be easy to find where the
25 revision was made. We'd like to do it that way to keep track

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 8th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 of where we are in the process so we don't get lost in the mound
2 of paperwork that's flying around now. And if anybody else has
3 a suggestion on how that might better be achieved, why, I think
4 we would like to hear it. But right now that's what -- that's
5 what we would suggest.

6 MR. ARMINSKI: And I think one other thing
7 that we discussed that might make it easier on all of us is rather
8 than, as we've been doing, discussing all the different disciplines
9 at one meeting, we may just in those follow-up meetings have just
10 fishery issues or wildlife issues or socioeconomic issues. That
11 way we don't have to get everybody tied in and doing up every-
12 body's time.

13 MR. ROBINSON: That's a good point, Tom.
14 This meeting that we're sitting at here is number four and we've
15 just a couple of days ago sent out the invitations and the papers
16 that would be discussed at the fifth meeting. We anticipate
17 having about eight, nine, perhaps ten first-round meetings, and
18 toward the end of that process we would certainly expect that
19 part of those meetings would be devoted, in addition to the new
20 business that we have, for example at this meeting the papers
21 we're taking the first look at, but the meetings toward the end
22 of the -- the eighth, ninth, tenth meetings, somewhere in there,
23 would include a lot of revised papers as old business, as we had
24 touched on in our previous discussions. So that we can expect
25 a transition somewhere in that time frame. And, importantly,

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8381

1 I think that Tom's point of mentioning what we'd like to try to
2 do is to organize it on a topical basis so that, for example,
3 the fisheries papers can be looked at in -- in a group, or wild-
4 life papers in a group, or socioeconomic papers in a group, et
5 cetera. We think that would expedite the process tremendously
6 and assist you all too in management of your time. Okay.

7 MR. ARMINSKI: On to new business. The first
8 paper we're going to discuss today is S-2, this is the significance
9 of project impacts on lifestyles in area communities. Our posi-
10 tion is that the lifestyles in these communities may change
11 regardless of the project. However, the Power Authority is going
12 to implement mitigation measures such as the worker transportation
13 plan that strives to isolate these communities from project im-
14 pacts as much as possible. And that we will institute a public
15 participation and monitoring program that will allow residents
16 to express their concerns and so that we'd be able to address
17 project impacts in those communities. Let's see, who's going
18 to -- Sharon's going to discuss this paper.

19 MS. VAISSIERE: The findings in this paper
20 are based on four kinds of information. And the first of those
21 is the historical information on development projects and other
22 growth activities that have occurred in the area. The second
23 is historical population data for area communities that tells
24 us the kinds of fluctuations that have occurred in those communi-
25 ties in the past. The third is updated population projections for

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8581

1 the communities with and without the project. And finally, results
2 of socioeconomic and sociocultural studies that have occurred
3 in area communities that give us an idea of how long the residents
4 that are in those communities now have lived there, and have given
5 us some idea about their attitudes towards growth.

6 MR. ARMINSKI: Any discussion?

7 MR. BEDARD: Yes, I have a point.

8 MR. ARMINSKI: Bruce?

9 MR. BEDARD: In here you refer to Trapper
10 Creek, does that include the smaller communities like Gold Creek
11 and Curry?

12 MS. VAISSIERE: It doesn't.

13 MR. BEDARD: It doesn't?

14 MS. VAISSIERE: No.

15 MR. BEDARD: Okay, because the concern I
16 have is there is a small Native community at Gold Creek and there's
17 also a much larger community on the Paxson side that resides in
18 the Paxson area year-round that would be impacted by this project
19 in the summer months. And there is a small population at Curry
20 Ridge.

21 MS. VAISSIERE: There's a small population
22 of what?

23 MR. BEDARD: Of inhabitants at Curry Ridge.
24 On the Cantwell on Page 4 you mention that the Cantwell people
25 resided in the area the medium of was eight years. That would

GEMINI

Reporting Services
843 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 be true of the community change that took place when the highway
2 was built. It tends -- when Frank Orth did this, if they did
3 it on this side of the community, they would've gotten that kind
4 of analysis. If they had done it on this side of the community
5 they would've gotten a different analysis. The Cantwell Native
6 people have lived there all their lives. And so I'm not sure
7 whether Frank Orth got a rounded enough data to state that the
8 median residency was eight years when in reality at least 50%
9 of the population has been there more than eight years. I know
10 most of the people up there. I just wanted to bring that point
11 out. There is a Native community which is separate from the non-
12 Native community, which is really on the other side of the road
13 on the highway. And most of the people that go there and do
14 studies, they stay in the hotel, and they get a tendency of sur-
15 veying people that come into the restaurant and use the local
16 businesses. But they're all on that strip and it's primarily
17 the non-Native community.

18 MS. BERGMANN: Bruce, I might just add on
19 that that we did an additional survey in the Cantwell area this
20 year and these papers don't reflect that information.

21 MR. BEDARD: Okay, you probably found what
22 I'm saying to be somewhat accurate --

23 MS. BERGMANN: Yes, I think those numbers
24 will be updated and reflected, so I think your comment will be
25 -- will be accommodated.

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 8th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 MR. BEDARD: Plus the populations that they
2 show here for 1980 are much greater now. Also on -- Let's see,
3 on Page 5, I don't know if this is good wording, I'm not criti-
4 cizing it to any great extent, but it says "young counterculture
5 type of resident relies on food stamps and other government assis-
6 tance rather than seeking a true subsistence lifestyle". This
7 is somewhat true, but there is also some young people that like
8 that kind of lifestyle that don't live on food stamps, and I think
9 it's kind of crude wording.

10 MS. VAISSIERE: That's a quote, Bruce, from
11 another source in that --

12 MR. BEDARD: -- Okay, yeah, I'm just a little
13 uneasy with that kind of wording.

14 MS. VAISSIERE: Well, okay.

15 MR. BEDARD: The self-sufficient lifestyle,
16 again, is very small. Most of your elders in the Cantwell area
17 don't do any lifestyle living anymore. The younger people, again,
18 are taking up a white style lifestyle in Cantwell, and -- But
19 you get into Gold Creek, you do have that one Native family that
20 does live there, they're kind of living their old lifestyle.
21 But that's very rare.

22 MR. LOWENFELS: I might add that their life-
23 style is more gracious than mine.

24 MR. BEDARD: But -- anyway, the self-
25 sufficient lifestyle is a very difficult lifestyle in that

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 particular area, and I just wanted to bring that out. Let's see,
2 plus their concern is generally an average concern. But one of
3 the things I did want to point out is that I don't want to -- I
4 don't feel it's fair for the project to have to lead the brunt
5 of a lot of the social/economic impacts that they think is going
6 to occur when a lot of these things have already occurred. There's
7 a four million acre Denali planning block, and I've got it right
8 here and anyone that's from BLM is aware of it. It's open to
9 mineral leasing and open to general mining laws. And all the --
10 all the land on the north side of the project area that is
11 federally owned, that's four million acres of land that's all
12 open to mineral leasing and general mining laws. And that kind
13 of impact can be more devastating than the project, in my opinion.
14 And in addition to that you have the Ahtna lands over here that
15 some type of development, I'm sure, is going to take place 'cause
16 some of this land, like CIRI's land, are in the Mat-Su Borough,
17 and the Mat-Su Borough is waiting for the day they can tax that.
18 So the Natives are going to be forced to do something economically
19 to meet that tax base. CIRI's lands are kind of below the State
20 lands, which the State's corridor comes in kind of like this and
21 loops up this way. And they have a quarter million acres of land
22 that they're going to be in the same boat, whether the project
23 goes or not --

24 MR. LATKA: -- We're not going to pay the
25 Borough taxes, though.

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 9th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 MR. BEDARD: Then you've got on the west
2 -- the far west side the recent remote lands and the Indian remote
3 area that was opened up to entry and quite a few people are now
4 residing in those remote sites. So these changes are taking place
5 and I don't think it's fair for the project to have to be blamed
6 for a lot of the impacts that this right now is creating itself.
7 And mining, surface mining, is going to be most of this mining
8 is going to do more damage than this project is ever going to
9 occur. I just want to bring that point out.

10 MR. LOWENFELS: We love you. So you agree
11 with our position?

12 MR. BEDARD: Well, the only thing I would
13 like to see emphasized is that as a mitigation measure not only
14 to the Native community but to the surrounding community that
15 we utilized to the fullest extent possible local hire preference
16 and local contract preference as a mitigation to those people.
17 Because one of the biggest things in the intertie that I'm sure
18 that APA people experienced was some disgruntled people because
19 of the Spanish people that were hired from -- I'm not sure whether
20 they were from Mexico or not -- to do the clearing on the inter-
21 tie, and there was local people at Talkeetna that were capable
22 of doing it and really got upset when they found out that some
23 of these people weren't even U. S. citizens. So again, I want
24 to emphasize that that is a very strong plus for APA, to have
25 that in their mitigation, that they'll do the utmost to try to

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 9th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 comply with the local hire laws as well as give local preference
2 to contractors as well as local preference for hiring.

3 MR. ARMINSKI: That's discussed in another
4 paper, I think it's S-4.

5 MS. BERGMANN: S-4, right.

6 MR. BEDARD: Oh, okay. Well, I was looking
7 at that as part of this impact, because you're going to offset
8 some of that attitude about, you know, "You're disturbing my life-
9 style if I can't get something out of". It's really, you know,
10 upsetting.

11 MR. LOWENFELS: When are those figures going
12 to be available for inclusion?

13 MS. BERGMANN: At the end of June, or a little
14 earlier than that. End of June at the latest. Of '85.

15 MR. ARMINSKI: Any other discussion on S-2?
16 Okay. Next paper is F-6, this is significance of physical effects
17 of access corridors on fish habitat. The paper proposes some
18 mitigation measures, and it's our position that their use will
19 ensure that the impacts on fish habitat would be insignificant.
20 Phil?

21 MR. SCORDELIS: Basically, because there
22 is no master plan for road construction, at this time there's
23 no design, there's no specific location, the paper had to be pre-
24 pared in a somewhat general manner. I relied upon the information
25 in the license application, the final Best Management Practice

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 8th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 manuals that were recently distributed, and ADF&G survey of the
2 stream crossings in the -- along the corridor, the proposed access
3 corridor, and information in general literature. I also relied
4 upon my experience as a field biologist for the Forest Service
5 down in Southeast Alaska to assess the limitations of constructing
6 roads in remote locations. I'd like to mention that the mitiga-
7 tion measures presented are principally preventative-type measures
8 and that a mitigation plan that includes corrective or replenish-
9 ment-type measures in case of unforeseen impacts is being prepared
10 at this time, I believe by Entrix. There is a more comprehensive-
11 type mitigation plan for access in the works.

12 MR. SMITH: The Gold Creek/Devil Canyon to
13 Watana corridor, would that remain unchanged if the Denali access
14 was -- was not licensed? In other words, your analysis here
15 covers that portion between Gold Creek and Watana. Is that fixed,
16 no matter what alternative it will be licensed?

17 MR. SCORDELIS: That -- that's actually two
18 corridors, as I interpret it, is the Gold Creek to Devil Canyon
19 railroad corridor, and then across the river, connected by a road-
20 way and a bridge, is a road up to Watana. Now, are you talking
21 about the whole length of that corridor?

22 MR. SMITH: Um-hm, either way you might take
23 it, both separately or -- What I'm wondering is, the DEIS recom-
24 mended against the northerly access route. Now, if it turns out
25 that that's what licensed, would this paper allow us to address

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 8th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 impacts to the fisheries along the corridor that FERC might
2 license? And I imagine that would be some sort of either a rail
3 or road access from Gold Creek to Watana?

4 MR. ARMINSKI: Yes, I think it would, because
5 the practices are generally the same, and where we're going to
6 get into the specificity is when we actually go out and have to
7 design the crossings and everything, and those will all be done
8 to a certain standard, you know, Fish & Game's culvert permits
9 and roads will be constructed to certain highway standards. So
10 I think this would apply no matter what the routes were.

11 MR. SCORDELIS: Of course, the only thing
12 that would change would be the number of -- possibly the number
13 of anadromous fish streams --

14 MR. ARMINSKI: -- Right --

15 MR. SCORDELIS: -- that were crossed versus
16 resident fish streams. And that's a specific, I would consider
17 that a specific.

18 MR. SMITH: A railroad, wouldn't it require
19 more -- for switchbacks or whatever, more or less crossings?

20 DR. FLEMING: There are about three or four
21 questions you've asked.

22 MR. SMITH: I've got time.

23 DR. FLEMING: If FERC did not license the
24 Denali Highway access, then access would have to come from the
25 west. I think our analysis indicates that going on the north

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 8th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 side of the river from Watana to Devil Canyon would be the most
2 effective way to go. And that is where both road and the trans-
3 mission goes. We then have in the existing application a rail
4 link from Devil Canyon to Gold Creek. Presumably that would re-
5 main. Now, what remains unanswered is whether FERC would or would
6 not license the project with road access, and the Power Authority
7 has always maintained the position that road access was essentially
8 essential. And that it looked unlikely that road access would
9 continue north on the east side of the Talkeetna River and then
10 the Susitna River from Talkeetna, but would probably come in from
11 the Park Highway via the Indian River, as we studied earlier.
12 So it's not clear what FERC would license if they did not choose
13 to concur with the Denali Highway. And the process all remains
14 the same, and what would have to be dealt with is updating our
15 information on some additional corridors. We've already done
16 some analysis but we'd have to go back and make sure it was up
17 to date.

18 MR. ROACH: I have a question. Why was the
19 route chosen rather than going in from the west? Is it terrain
20 or --?

21 DR. FLEMING: Well, there -- if you choose
22 to go in by -- First planning consideration is that there was
23 not going to be any construction activity prior to receipt of
24 the license. When you have the license in terms of -- another
25 desirable factor is to constrain the construction period as much

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 as possible. As you extend the construction period you're hit
2 by inflation and a lot of other things that drive up total project
3 costs. If you are going to go in from the west by rail only,
4 there's no way of putting in a pioneer railroad --

5 MR. ROACH: -- No, I mean for road --

6 DR. FLEMING: -- and you would -- it would
7 take you about two years to put in a railroad. If you're going
8 to come in from the Denali side south, our assessment is that
9 there's a very high expectation that you would succeed in
10 establishing a road in one construction season. If you come in
11 from the west, there are several ways you could do it, but it's
12 -- it would require some significant bridging. You either have
13 to make a high bridge across the lower end of Portage Creek, or
14 across the Susitna River, and the kind of bridge you're talking
15 about is like a two-year bridge. Or you would have to go down
16 and around Portage Creek, and there's about six or seven bridges
17 that are analogous to the one up at Hurricane -- is that the right
18 -- the right bridge crossing? They're not -- they're not culvert
19 bridges, they're big bridges. And so in terms of trying to meet
20 the construction criteria and keep the construction period short,
21 we've always felt that it was better design planning to come in
22 from the Denali Highway. It shortens --

23 MR. ROACH: Then you're estimating to build
24 a road in one construction season, coming in from the north?

25 DR. FLEMING: That's correct. You can build

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 a road -- a road that you can use, and then you would probably
2 spend the next construction season going back and kind of upgrading
3 it and finishing it out. But what you have to do the first year
4 is get your men and equipment in to start preparing and getting
5 starting on the diversion tunnel. So you're not talking about
6 a lot of people, but you're talking about getting in the big equip-
7 ment that would allow you to start the diversion.

8 MR. ROACH: If you're going to build a road
9 in from -- in one construction season you're going to need a bor-
10 row pit. And you're going to have to do -- you know, in these
11 papers you say you're not going to use borrow pits, you're going
12 to go to roadside borrow. And I don't think that'll work in that
13 country if you're going to -- if you're going to plan on building
14 something in one year. It may not work at all, you know, anyway.

15 DR. FLEMING: Well, that's why we're con-
16 ducting the facilities planning exercise this summer, to try and
17 get the best information we can in terms of the actual conditions
18 on the rights of way.

19 MR. SCORDELIS: I don't know if that's exactly
20 correct. I've talked to our geologic -- geotech person and,
21 don't take this as gospel, as I understand it as a biologist,
22 the plan is to get into the Watana camp area and there are several
23 borrow -- large borrow pits in that area, and to begin construc-
24 tion of the work at both ends of the road. I may be wrong, it
25 may be just at the lower end of the road and work back, so that

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 there will be -- there is a borrow area for road material. And
2 according to the geotech person, the requirements for borrow or
3 quarry sites along the road are minimal. Unfortunately Mike is
4 not here today, he's -- I think he's got the flu. I asked him
5 to be here.

6 MR. THRALL: I don't -- I don't think that
7 there's any guarantee that there wouldn't be some borrow pits
8 along that road. The intent was to try and minimize that to the
9 degree possible, as a -- just as a environmental mitigation.

10 MR. ROACH: Yeah. If money's no object,
11 you could haul borrow from each end of the project. You're build-
12 ing a road how many miles long?

13 DR. FLEMING: It's 44 miles.

14 MR. ROACH: About 40 miles, so you -- you
15 wouldn't want to haul borrow that -- 22 miles would be half of
16 that distance.

17 MR. SCORDELIS: Well, one of the pits --

18 MR. ROACH: -- 23 miles --

19 MR. SCORDELIS: -- one of the borrow sites
20 is away from the river, it's probably 10 miles up, so you're
21 gaining some haul costs.

22 DR. FLEMING: We've done investigations and
23 there are sources of borrow material all the way along the road.
24 I don't think we're ever more than a mile or two from a potential
25 borrow site. What we've said in response to earlier comments

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 from the resources agencies is that we are going to try and use
2 a side borrow technique to minimize the profile of the road and
3 to minimize the disruption of the countryside. And that's not
4 to say there may not be areas where that's going to be entirely
5 feasible, where we are going to have to haul gravel. In spite
6 of what you've said, we are concerned with the costs of projects
7 and, as you're aware, the length of haul of material is a primary
8 consideration in this projects. So, you know, we plan on mini-
9 mizing the profile of the road as much as possible by using a
10 side borrow technique, and we also hope to minimize the hauling
11 of material as much as possible.

12 MR. ROACH: Yes, you'll be dealing with --
13 you'll be mostly in alpine country and the summers are short and
14 rainy, the material you'll be excavating will probably have a
15 high moisture content, and it'll -- When we built the first sec-
16 tion of the Denali Highway from Paxson up to 21 Mile, you work
17 with quite a bit of wet material, and it takes you quite a bit
18 longer than what you think. Or it takes the contractor quite
19 a bit longer.

20 DR. FLEMING: Who should we talk to get some
21 of that insight?

22 MR. ROACH: Dave Harmon, if he's still in
23 town, was project engineer on that job.

24 MR. LOWENFELS: Does he work at DOT or is
25 he --

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 MR. ROACH: No, he's -- he's working for
2 himself now.

3 MR. MARCHEGIANI: Could you spell his name?

4 MR. ROACH: It's H-A-R-M-O-N.

5 MR. ARMINSKI: Okay, any more comments on
6 F-6? Hank?

7 MR. HOSKINS: The total of 42 streams, the
8 sum of Tables 1, 2 and 3, will be impacted by either road or rail-
9 road access corridors. At present 38% of them have not been sam-
10 pled as to the presence or absence of fish. This work should
11 be accomplished this summer as existence of fish would have a
12 bearing on the design of the drainage facilities to be installed.
13 I don't know what your schedule might be to look at the rest of
14 those crossings in there.

15 MR. SCORDELIS: I'm not sure why these streams
16 weren't surveyed. I have a suspicion that they were relatively
17 small -- don't like to say insignificant, but I think insignifi-
18 cant is the term most appropriate for them. I haven't seen them
19 myself. Our plans are to survey -- do our own survey of the access
20 corridor this summer, get out there and look around a bit.

21 MR. ARMINSKI: Hank, I think it was -- I
22 think it was our position in the license application that regard-
23 less of whether or not those streams had been surveyed and the
24 fisheries resources identified, any culverts and things that were
25 placed in those streams would be done to fish passage standards.

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 8th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 So even if there wasn't an identified resource, if there was one
2 that appeared, it'd be taken care of.

3 MR. LOWENFELS: Is that a -- just speaking
4 in terms of FERC hearings, is that a gap that we need to fill
5 in order for you to be able to say, yeah, we really consulted
6 on that, or --

7 MR. HOSKINS: I think if the statement is
8 made that all drainage structures will be put in to fish passage
9 specifications as listed in the drainage structure manual and
10 the BNP (ph), that covers it as far as I'm concerned.

11 MR. ROSENBERG: I had a question on that.
12 The final -- I realize that -- what we just talked about, about
13 final design and all. But with that out of the way, when we do
14 go into final design there will be -- or, will there be flexibility
15 as far as the actual siting in regards to use of those streams
16 by fish as far as moving it a little to the left, moving it a
17 little to the right, what have you, because an area's been iden-
18 tified as being a spawning site or whatever?

19 MR. ARMINSKI: We expect -- what we wanted
20 to do was prepare that drainage structure manual and apply for
21 one permit, basically, for all the culverts and bridges. But
22 we expect that for each structure that we have to construct we'll
23 have to submit a design to Fish & Game to approve. But each one
24 of those will be designed in accordance with the manual, which
25 allows for passage.

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 8th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 MR. LOWENFELS: The short answer is yes,
2 though.

3 MR. ROSENBERG: The emphasis is what I'm
4 getting at.

5 MR. THRALL: Dan, right now we have a corri-
6 dor, that's all we have. This summer we hope to go out and do
7 some -- what we're calling a master plan, which is taking, you
8 know, from what was essentially a paper study layout basically,
9 and which is a feasibility level thing, and actually get on the
10 ground and look at that. And part of that we'll be looking at,
11 you know, where the road might cross streams. And at that point
12 we'll say, well, if we moved it over a little bit this way or
13 that way we think we'd be in much better terrain for the crossing.
14 So that'll be one more iteration. And then when you actually
15 get out there and are -- you know, then you have your actual
16 design and are in the construction, that's the third cut you get
17 at this. So there's at least two more cuts where we start to
18 get this down to more specific areas.

19 MR. ROSENBERG: Okay, thanks. That's all.

20 DR. FLEMING: The road you can wiggle to
21 a fair degree. The railroads don't wiggle very much. They are
22 very much set by grade and curve and, you know, nature conforms
23 to a railroad.

24 MR. ARMINSKI: Hank?

25 MR. HOSKINS: Mitigation measure Number V

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 on Page 13, the second sentence states "The construction of stream
2 crossings will be timed, where feasible, to avoid periods when
3 fish eggs and alevins are present in the streams." Instead of
4 this sentence, I suggest the Power Authority provide a periodicity
5 chart of the fish species life stages occurring in the streams.
6 Fish & Game Department as the permitting agency could then provide
7 the windows in which timing of construction must be completed.
8 This is certainly no new concept along the line.

9 One other comment -- or two other comments. The Fish
10 & Wildlife Service still is opposed to project access via the
11 road from Denali Highway to Watana. And impacts to fish and wild-
12 life resources from increased human uses should be addressed.

13 MR. SCORDELIS: I believe human uses is a
14 separate issue paper.

15 MR. ARMINSKI: Yes, it is.

16 MR. HOSKINS: I think it's a separate issue
17 paper, they have to be dovetailed, that's all.

18 MR. LATKA: Tom? We sent you over a memo,
19 Mike Granada's gone through the latest version of BMPM's (ph)
20 and compared them to our original comments. And it may not be
21 germane to this, or it may be, but our -- is there a mechanism
22 for revising those BMPM's? Because that's not discussed and hasn't
23 been discussed in the documents.

24 MR. ARMINSKI: Yes. Well, I think they're
25 going to have to be updated periodically to reflect, you know,

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 state of the art, but I think as well through the design process,
2 something's identified, or something's not appropriate, that can
3 be --

4 MR. LATKA: I think it's more a case of over-
5 looked.

6 MR. ARMINSKI: Overlooked.

7 MR. LATKA: Yes.

8 MR. BEDARD: I had two comments. On Page ii
9 where it talks about spills from vehicle accidents are not expected
10 to have significant impacts on fish habitat quality due to the
11 rapid initiation of clean-up efforts. I can agree with that, but
12 oil-carrying vehicles, if an event did occur, which we hope it
13 doesn't, they wouldn't be much different than a vehicle spill.
14 And I'm, you know, wondering why that wasn't mentioned. There
15 will be a lot oil-carrying or fuel-type carrying vehicles, diesel
16 as well as regular gasoline, and it could occur that a bad culvert
17 or something or bad potholes, flip a truck over. And I would
18 like to see that at least addressed.

19 MR. ARMINSKI: I think as part of the spill
20 contingency planning the contractor would have to be prepared
21 to handle a situation like that. And we can -- we can mention
22 that in here.

23 MR. BEDARD: And the only other point was,
24 like Fish & Wildlife Service and FERC, the Native people, which
25 APA's aware of, still support and has always stated, you know,

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 an all-southside route. It is still our position today, though
2 like we've said we will accept what is put in with the project,
3 though we won't agree with it.

4 MR. ARMINSKI: You'll use it but you won't
5 agree with it.

6 MR. MARCHEGIANI: Specifically on that, I'd
7 like to throw it back to Hank, and I'd like to ask Bruce if his
8 preference is a south side route --

9 DR. FLEMING: Let's not get into which route
10 people prefer on the road because we will be here the rest of
11 the day.

12 MR. LOWENFELS: In addition to which, the
13 Board has opined on this one.

14 MR. ARMINSKI: Any more discussion on F-6?

15 MR. ROSENBERG: I had just a couple of things
16 Well, some of my original comments were answered by Phil when
17 he said that the Entrix and -- is it Entrix? Entrix is preparing
18 a -- what, the monitoring and contingencies?

19 MR. SCORDELIS: I believe it's a mitigation
20 plan.

21 MR. ROSENBERG: Yes, but it will have moni-
22 toring and contingent -- and contingent types?

23 MR. GILBERTSON: The monitoring plan that
24 we're working on -- To tell you the truth, I'm not sure that it's
25 going to address that, but that would certainly be a subject for

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 discussion as we go over the mitigation and monitoring plan.

2 MR. ROSENBERG: Just things like that sen-
3 tence that Bruce just referred to about spills from vehicular
4 accidents are not expected to have significant impacts on fish
5 habitat quality due to the rapid initiation of clean-up efforts.
6 I think the intentions are very good and I support them all and
7 every -- so on and so forth. But if indeed there was a spill
8 and if indeed something went haywire with the clean-up, then,
9 of course, we need --

10 MR. GILBERTSON: Yeah, my fault. I thought
11 you were talking about a long-term monitoring. The construction
12 monitoring aspect of that, yes.

13 MR. ROSENBERG: Okay. That isn't clear.
14 So that type of thing we'll see later on. And under the mitiga-
15 tion measures, the second one, adherence to the Alaska Department
16 of Fish & Game's habitat protection regulations. There really
17 aren't any proposed protection regulations.

18 MR. ARMINSKI: I always make that comment,
19 and it always gets back, but it's proposed.

20 MR. ROSENBERG: Okay. Suffice it to say
21 the -- if you adhere to Alaska Department of Fish & Game's habitat
22 protection guidelines, they'll all go into the permit, more or
23 less, so more or less in some ways I guess it's just redundant
24 anyway. Because I think a lot of the Fish & Game guidelines or
25 the proposed regulations will end up in the permit stipulations,

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8691

1 which is taken care of in Number 1, and all those BMP's.

2 MR. LOWENFELS: You mean you're not going
3 to promulgate those regulations?

4 MR. ROSENBERG: I don't know. That's about
5 it. The only other thing I had, which is just back what we were
6 talking about before on the contingency and monitoring and so
7 on and so forth. I'd like to see something in here that just
8 mentions that in that monitoring and contingency planning, that
9 it will be done -- there's going to be things that may occur that
10 we obviously can't foresee, and we're going to have to get together
11 and discuss what's appropriate for mitigation, perhaps in the
12 case of an oil spill into a creek or what have you. Just some-
13 thing that says that that'll be done in consultation with the
14 various agencies, or what have you.

15 MR. ARMINSKI: Okay, F-8. This relates to
16 the significance of water quality and quantity effects of construc-
17 tion camps and the permanent village on fish habitat. Our posi-
18 tion is that the mitigation measures included in this paper will
19 ensure that the impacts of these facilities on fish habitat will
20 not be significant. Phil again.

21 MR. SCORDELIS: This paper was also prepared
22 with the same limitations as the access papers. There's no master
23 plan, the camp is not specifically located now, generally it's
24 subject to change depending upon input from other agencies and
25 other concerns. We again used the license application and the

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 Best Management Practices manuals and literature found in journals
2 to assess what the impacts might be.

3 MR. LOWENFELS: Any comments?

4 MR. SMITH: I couldn't find any mention of
5 any monitoring efforts, particularly for Tsusena and Deadman Creek.
6 It's in there?

7 MR. SCORDELIS: No.

8 MR. SMITH: Oh, okay. I think there was
9 earlier commitment to do that, and it probably ought to be incor-
10 porated into this.

11 MR. GILBERTSON: We're developing the moni-
12 toring plan for Tsusena and Deadman Creeks now with AGECC.

13 MR. SMITH: Maybe just a mention that that's
14 being done, then.

15 MR. GILBERTSON: Okay.

16 MR. LOWENFELS: When do you expect to have
17 those done? I hate to always ask you that question, that's all
18 I ever ask you.

19 MR. GILBERTSON: Well, I can tell you it
20 will be done by the end of June, because it's a fiscal year task
21 that we will have done this year. I think we'd probably have
22 it done by the first part of -- the first of June.

23 MR. LOWENFELS: Brad, any other --

24 MR. SMITH: No.

25 MR. LOWENFELS: Yes, Hank?

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 MR. HOSKINS: On Page 1, the first paragraph
2 under "Discussion" states a temporary airstrip of 2500 feet will
3 be constructed and later upgraded to a 6,000 foot permanent faci-
4 lity. Figure 1 on the next page does not support this statement
5 as both the temporary and the permanent airstrip in different
6 locations are shown here. Please clarify which is correct, the
7 verbal description or the figure depiction.

8 MR. SCORDELIS: The verbal description is
9 correct, the figure is straight out of the license application
10 and is -- that was an oversight on my part. I didn't have that
11 corrected.

12 MR. MARCHEGIANI: Which location is going
13 to be it? Or what's your guess at the location?

14 MR. SCORDELIS: I would guess where the tem-
15 porary one is now, but, as I said, that's more geotechnical
16 experience or input than fisheries. I can't give you any --

17 MR. HOSKINS: Right. It was just the extent
18 of habitat that might be disturbed that we were looking at.

19 MR. ARMINSKI: Any more discussion?

20 MR. ROSENBERG: No, just the same -- actually
21 some of the same comments as the last one apply to this one.

22 MR. SMITH: I have just kind of a general
23 question on the water withdrawal out of Tsusena Creek, estimated
24 1.5 cubic feet. Doesn't sound like a lot of water, but it goes
25 on to say that a series of groundwater wells will serve as a

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 back-up system. Was there any thought given to making that the
2 primary system and then withdrawing --

3 MR. SCORDELIS: I don't know.

4 MR. ARMINSKI: I don't think -- I don't think
5 so. It's my recollection, and I'm sure they're going to do more
6 work on it, but they drilled some wells a couple years ago and
7 basically there was real low production, if any. So it doesn't
8 look like there's --

9 MR. SMITH: So it's not going to be a real
10 groovy back-up system?

11 MR. ARMINSKI: It doesn't look like there's
12 a real good source of groundwater out there.

13 DR. FLEMING: They'd flown up well casing
14 and drilled some holes up there -- it'd be two years ago, two
15 and a half years ago. That was the expectation, that serving
16 the construction site could be handled by the wells, and they
17 just never got a good -- good enough flow.

18 MR. LATKA: Tom? You might have already
19 discussed this. I had left my copy back at the office and had
20 to go call them. But Jerry Mauer (ph) had a concern on Page 5.
21 He's with our water resource section. And the eighth line down,
22 there's a statement that says, "Increased levels of nitrogen and
23 phosphorus are expected in the effluent from both camps". And
24 she was curious how you're going to treat domestic waste and since
25 there's no further discussion of this in the paper, no

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 quantification, she was concerned because, depending on the levels,
2 there could be an effect on aquatic habitat.

3 MR. ARMINSKI: Well, we're going to treat
4 to secondary standards. And I guess I would think if there was
5 any effect, it'd probably be a beneficial one. But --

6 MR. LATKA: Put something in the water, I
7 don't know.

8 MR. ARMINSKI: But all effluents will be
9 in accordance with EPA and DEC standards.

10 MR. SCORDELIS: Might add that the location
11 of the outfall, or proposed location of the outfall, is in a tur-
12 bulent section of Deadman Creek, and it's just a short distance
13 downstream to Tsusena -- or, to the Susitna River. I think once
14 in that turbulent section there will be thorough mixing and rapid
15 transport downstream, so the -- our water quality person does
16 not feel that there would be a substantial increase in produc-
17 tivity in that short time period and short distance.

18 MR. LATKA: Probably the only thing would
19 be just a little more explanation so the document stands on its
20 own. It wasn't clear.

21 MR. ARMINSKI: Okay, next paper is C-1, this
22 is the identification and significance of loss of affected
23 cultural/historical sites. And our position is that we propose
24 to adopt the mitigation measures presented in this paper, and
25 that implementation will result in the project having no adverse

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 effect on significant cultural resources, including historic,
2 archeological and architectural properties, and that we'll also
3 comply with all State and federal laws relating to these resources.
4 Joel, are you going to --

5 MR. KLEIN: The information that's presented
6 here was obtained through a review of existing information in
7 files of the State, and literature, but primarily came from five
8 years of field investigations conducted by the University of
9 Alaska museum, which resulted in the survey of all of the sur-
10 veyable portions of the project area, with the exception of the
11 linear features, that were felt by the museum to have a potential
12 for containing historical or archeological sites. In addition
13 we've been in consultation with both the State Historical Preser-
14 vation Office, the appropriate federal agencies and the profes-
15 sional community in the state regarding their feelings as to the
16 potential significance of these findings.

17 MR. ARMINSKI: Any comments?

18 MR. BEDARD: Yes, just a couple. There has
19 been one burial site was found, and I believe it was Dr. Dixon
20 that wrote a letter in regards to that and wanted to know our
21 views on how that should be treated. Talking with Knik and Chick-
22 aloon and Tyonek, all three kind of concur unanimous on keeping
23 the site as is at this time, but if it does become impounded,
24 we definitely would want it moved and find a location that would
25 be suitable as close as possible to the original site. In

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 addition to that what we would like to have in any removal of
2 significant artifacts or burial grounds that will be impounded,
3 we would like to see some kind of historical markers placed on
4 the nearest high ground indicating that that site did once exist
5 there for future historians and et cetera. We would like to see
6 that occur. I would like to compliment the University for what
7 they have done in the past. I've worked real close with this
8 over the last five years and I think they've done a real good
9 job, especially for the number of sites that have been sighted.

10 The other concern, I believe, was in relationship to the
11 federal laws as it relates to private property dwellers on Indian
12 lands. They're both roughly the same when you're involving
13 removing artifacts from Native lands, we definitely would like
14 to be informed. And you might want to educate your people that
15 are in the field doing these studies to look at land ownership
16 ahead of time, in the event something had been removed, to notify
17 the party involved. That's in the museum, in the trust that some-
18 what verbally established, it's never been written in a written
19 document. And if you look at the federal regulations, this should
20 be in writing, some kind of a trust document be set up to maintain
21 those in the university.

22 MR. KLEIN: We're aware of all the concerns
23 you've mentioned, and it is our intention to address them all
24 in the mitigation plan that's finally developed. And I think
25 there's more information on the mitigation plan in the next issue.

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 MR. BEDARD: That's all I have on that.

2 MR. ARMINSKI: Other comments?

3 MS. BITTNER: Just one comment on the --
4 a follow-up one on the CIRI comment on putting markers or sites.
5 In some of the mitigation the sites are only partially mitigated,
6 and so it has to balance out bringing attention to an archeolo-
7 gical site where people can vandalize and hunt and doing a general
8 interpretation of the area without sort of specifically locating.
9 I like the idea of interpretation of the area --

10 MR. BEDARD: -- I'm only talking about sites
11 that are removed.

12 MS. BITTNER: Yes, well, sometimes --

13 MR. BEDARD: And are impounded. Once they're
14 impounded -- you know, removed first and then impounded, all I
15 want is some kind of marker to indicate that originally this was
16 where the site was located, so you don't lose the historical sig-
17 nificance.

18 MS. BITTNER: I think there can be some very
19 good interpretation area without -- you know, in sort of a general
20 way without directing the people right to where it is, whether
21 it's completely underground or under water or something like that.

22 MR. BEDARD: Well, the sites -- yes, the
23 sites I'm referring to are quite remote, even with the lakes in
24 place they're going to still be quite remote. Jade Creek is the
25 one I've been -- I was at that site, or the Butte Lake site,

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 I've been at the Clark Lakes/Clark Creek sites (ph), and they
2 are significant. And there are others that primarily were maybe
3 a aborigine had just used it as a overnight camping and some of
4 his -- making new blades, there's some sherds (ph) that were found
5 this kind of stuff. Those things are significant, you can't find
6 them all over the place, you can find them right here in Anchor-
7 age.

8 MR. KLEIN: I think, Bruce, it's important
9 to note that is the vast majority of the type of sites that have
10 been found.

11 MS. BITTNER: We will be working and have
12 been working closely with APA and the consultants and feel com-
13 fortable with this.

14 MR. BEDARD: I just want to get the point
15 across that, you know, a significant location should be identified
16 especially for future historians that are in Alaskana and they
17 want to know what took place in a particular area, they can find
18 that data.

19 MS. BITTNER: Point well taken.

20 MR. ARMINSKI: Other comments?

21 MR. SHINN: Well, aside from burials are
22 there any sacred sites that are known?

23 MR. BEDARD: It's -- it's difficult. The
24 Athabascan people at one time -- there is a significant site which
25 we're aware of near Paxson, and that's a major archeological

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 preservation area. And if you look at the whole area and the
2 number of sites you have found, it -- that may have spread out
3 through that entire region. It's real difficult to determine
4 whether maybe 5,000 years ago there was villages there. And the
5 good potential is that Fog Lakes could have been an actual village
6 location. Such significant sites have already been found. Plus
7 it is our own feeling that we don't want fossil (ph) hunters going
8 all over the countryside either on our lands after the project
9 is in place, and we've addressed this with APA. So we will
10 require restrictions on any type of artifact hunters. I believe
11 on federal lands anything like an arrowhead found on the ground
12 you can -- you can take it and keep it, but on --

13 MS. BITTNER: Uh-uh.

14 MR. BEDARD: They've changed that?

15 MS. BITTNER: It's against the law on State
16 land as well.

17 MR. BEDARD: No, I was thinking that on
18 federal lands, like in the Lower 48, they don't seem to --

19 MS. BITTNER: -- No, they just do it, but
20 it's against the law.

21 MS. THOMPSON: Well, from the surface. You
22 can collect off the surface --

23 MR. BEDARD: Off the surface. Like if you
24 find an arrowhead on the surface --

25 MR. KLEIN: You can't dig. But you can't dig.

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 MR. BEDARD: But we don't even want that,
2 we don't even want surface scroungers.

3 MR. SHINN: One other question. There's
4 a predictive model mentioned. Do you have a -- is that going to
5 generated from the sort of the thing that the university was --
6 initiated, their research?

7 MR. KLEIN: Well, we're using all the avail-
8 able data we can, and obviously the primary data base there is
9 the results of the university's work. The model that's being
10 developed should be complete sometime within the next two months
11 or so, and then there will be field testing. Field testing will
12 take place along the linear feature, and that's going to be a
13 primary source of information on location of sites and potential
14 impacts for those.

15 MR. SHINN: Will that be checked against what
16 was found by the university?

17 MR. KLEIN: Yes, it will.

18 MR. ARMINSKI: Other comments? Okay, let's
19 go through C-2 and then we can take a break here. C-2 is the
20 formulation and implementation of a cultural resources mitigation
21 plan. We proposed to adopt the mitigation measures that are pre-
22 sented in this paper. It's our position that these measures and
23 their implementation will result in the project having no adverse
24 effect on significant properties. Joel, are you going to --

25 MR. KLEIN: Okay, yes. Project impacts were

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 assessed principally from comparison of project descriptions as
2 contained in the license application and compared with the infor-
3 mation we presently have on known and potential archeological
4 and historic site locations. And we are at this point just
5 beginning the process of fleshing out the mitigation plan, but
6 we see basically five categories of mitigation. That's avoidance,
7 preservation in place, data recovery, which would be salvage
8 excavation, monitoring, and public interpretation and education
9 program.

10 MR. ARMINSKI: Comments?

11 MS. BITTNER: My comments before sort of
12 incorporated the two of them together. We've been working very
13 closely and these are all very standard. And I see this as a
14 -- just a general sort of guidance of the types of mitigation,
15 and all the specifics and the sites and the predictive modeling
16 we'll get at a later date, the actual specifics, and that's really
17 when we start negotiating in a sense on the particular sites and
18 the types of data recovery. But just as a general guidance, you
19 know, I'm comfortable with it.

20 MR. ARMINSKI: Any other comments? Bruce?

21 MR. BEDARD: The only thing I want to say
22 is that my comments from the previous paper are somewhat applicable
23 to this paper. I did have one question in regards to -- Let's
24 see. Oh, the public interpretation and education program. I
25 didn't quite understand what would take place there. That's on

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 Page 3.

2 MR. KLEIN: Well, for most of the sites that
3 are up -- the prehistorical archeological sites, their value lies
4 in the data that's within them, and it's our intent to look at
5 popular -- things like population publications so that both
6 Native groups and residents of the state in general will be able
7 to understand what was found up there and why it was important,
8 and make a general contribution to the lay public. Also we're
9 looking at the feasibility of on-site exhibits, markers, things
10 of that sort.

11 MR. BEDARD: One concern on Page 4, the
12 training program for the workers. Is this training program going
13 to be limited to just the supervisors or all workers in general
14 or -- you get a dozer operator out there and the supervisor's
15 at another location, that dozer operator is going to doze right
16 through. And I'm just wondering, if you have a training program
17 to include your supervisors, maybe it'd be wise to have the super-
18 visors delegate and emphasize the importance of the dozer opera-
19 tors to try to observe the best they can to -- if they unearth
20 some bones not to look at it as just maybe wild bones but to stop
21 and report the find.

22 MR. ARMINSKI: We're going to have an en-
23 vironment indoctrination, and I think it's going to be probably
24 required that the contractors do it. And it's certainly some-
25 thing that could be addressed in that.

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 MR. BEDARD: That's it.

2 MR. SHINN: I have one question of just
3 general interest about the research of the effects of inundation.
4 Where is that, what stage is that at?

5 MR. KLEIN: We're primarily at this point
6 working with information that's been collected by the National
7 Park Service in their reservoir inundation studies. It's a multi-
8 year, very lengthy and detailed study. We're trying now to --
9 plus gathering information from the engineers at Harza on the
10 hydraulics and so on. I'm trying to dovetail the actual condi-
11 tions for the project with the information that the Park Service
12 has collected.

13 MR. SHINN: And then one other question about
14 the sample of sites to be mitigated by data recovery. And the
15 rationale, of course, would be linked to the research questions
16 that -- in the mitigation plan.

17 MR. KLEIN: That's one of the considerations,
18 that's a primary one, but there are others as well in terms of
19 just feasibility and cost effectiveness and scheduling, location.

20 MR. SHINN: And then the answers to questions
21 that might be left out due to feasibility considerations, those
22 sorts of things -- the sorts of shortfalls may or may not be
23 acceptable based on --

24 MR. KLEIN: Well, at this point we're anti-
25 cipating there wouldn't be problems like that, since there is

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 a high degree of redundancy among the types of sites in the pro-
2 ject area, so we believe at this point that we've got a lot of
3 flexibility and will be able to accommodate concerns like that.

4 MR. ARMINSKI: Any other comments? Okay,
5 why don't we take a break for ten minutes and . . .

6 (OFF RECORD)

7 MR. ARMINSKI: Okay, funlovers, the next
8 one we'd like to discuss is W-2, the significance of reduction
9 in black bear denning and foraging habitat. It's our position
10 that black bears will be impacted by the project and the mitiga-
11 tion measures presented in this paper will reduce the level of
12 the impact. The goal of the Power Authority is to provide compen-
13 sation for residual impacts either through out-of-kind habitat
14 enhancement or preservation of important habitat. Randy?

15 MR. FAIRBANKS: Okay, the data sources for
16 black bear paper were basically the field studies that have been
17 conducted by ADF&G in the project area, and the open scientific
18 literature on black bears. Basically the paper concludes that
19 black bear habitat is currently quite limited in the project area.
20 The project area is kind of on the edge of the major portion of
21 black bear range in the Susitna basin. That inundation will cause
22 a loss of foraging and denning habitat, most important between
23 Tsusena Creek and the Oshetna River, where black bear habitat
24 is currently limited to a pretty narrow fringe of forest. There's
25 several mitigation measures presented in the paper that will reduce

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 the level of impact, and addition mitigation is intended to be
2 developed through out of kind habitat enhancement and/or the pre-
3 servation of important habitat.

4 MR. ARMINSKI: Comments?

5 MR. HOSKINS: I have my revenge. I'll just
6 read the statement. Paraphrasing your position up there on Page
7 1, the mitigation goal will be achieved by providing out of kind
8 habitat enhancement or preservation of important habitat. The
9 paper discusses impacts on denning and foraging and states a large
10 area of forested habitats will be removed in association with
11 Watana development. This loss of foraging habitat from impound-
12 ment filling will be the major adverse concern, according to this
13 evaluation. Black bears have a demonstrated propensity for the
14 forested habitat which is to be impounded. Locations of bears
15 in spruce forests were nearly equivalent to the observation of
16 bears in shrublands. This may indicate a higher use of coniferous
17 habitat, since a dense cover may have precluded aerial observa-
18 tions. Studies indicate approximately one-third of the black
19 bear dens in the area of the impoundment occur below the normal
20 maximum operating level of the reservoir. An in-depth discussion
21 in terms of available habitat, den density and intra- and inter-
22 specific adult space requirements on the impact to displaced bears
23 should be appropriate. Mitigation measure number 5, Page 8, should

24

25

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8691

1 be expanded. The out of kind enhancement is addressed by the
2 old standard of improving habitat for moose because bears eat
3 moose. That takes care of providing a full belly, but it does
4 not address the winter sleeping needs. Please provide information
5 that couples the preservation of important habitats portion of
6 this endorsed measure with the black bear denning requirements.

7 MR. FAIRBANKS: Okay --

8 MR. LOWENFELS: -- Could you repeat -- Oh,
9 sorry.

10 MR. FAIRBANKS: To address your last point
11 there, mitigation measure number 5, I think the term "out of kind
12 enhancement", we're not really using that to mean that increasing
13 moose is going to benefit black bear, because that would be in-
14 kind enhancement. We're talking about -- So far we haven't really
15 come up with a good way of compensating for black bear habitat
16 loss through habitat enhancement. It's possible that if we design
17 the crushing, burning programs in the right manner, and that would
18 mean by designing them so that a variety of habitats are inter-
19 spersed, and we continue to include a large portion of mature
20 forest, we think that at least we're not going to hurt black bears
21 and we may actually be able to improve black bear habitat in some
22 areas, such as what's potentially occurred in the Swanson River
23 burn area, where there's still high densities of black bear even
24 though you've had a significant burn, because there still is a
25 lot of mature forest around. So anyway, the point is we're not

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 trying to say that compensation for moose is going to provide
2 in-kind compensation for black bear because it's not, except to
3 a minor degree, possibly, if we can design the management scheme
4 on these mitigation lands correctly. But the only approach that
5 we can see taking to provide, you know, more -- a fuller compensa-
6 tion for loss of black bear habitat is to provide additional --
7 an incremental additional amount of moose habitat, which is an
8 out-of-kind measure, and it certainly -- it's the type of thing
9 that we'd like to hear comment on. You know, is that going to
10 be satisfactory from the agency standpoint, because so far we
11 haven't really been able to determine a way of significantly
12 increasing habitat productivity for black bears directly. So
13 I guess that's the -- the only point that's being made there.

14 Other than that, the preservation of important habitats
15 is another factor -- another way of compensating, potentially
16 compensating for black bear and other species impacts where --
17 where it's difficult to improve habitat through enhancement.
18 And so far the key area that we've identified for that means of
19 compensation is the Prairie Creek drainage, and we're presently
20 working with the Natives trying to come up with a way to provide
21 some protection for that drainage, although that's going to be,
22 again, an out-of-kind enhancement -- or, out-of-kind mitigation
23 for brown -- or, black bears, because it's primarily going to
24 benefit brown bears. But obviously we can't -- we're not going
25 to be able to find a place like that for every species. We've

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 got to -- you know, we'd like to hear comments on what the agencies
2 really think we should do beyond providing a habitat management
3 program to increase moose so we can add on additional increments
4 of carrying capacity to say, overcompensate for moose so that
5 maybe we can achieve some out-of-kind compensation for other
6 species. And then the other -- the other thing that we've iden-
7 tified is potentially the preservation of Prairie Creek.

8 MR. HOSKINS: You might consider the preser-
9 vation of areas that are known black bear denning habitats away
10 from the project, perhaps, or contiguous to the project. We've
11 looked at the areas, for example, of adjacent lands to enhance
12 for moose browse production, consider the preservation of areas
13 where bears exist right now if there is some threat to them, set
14 them aside for bear denning.

15 MR. FAIRBANKS: If we could identify areas
16 like that, that might be a viable alternative.

17 MR. HOSKINS: This is the point I'm driving
18 at, Randy, right here, is I think that food requirements and
19 foraging will be met through this enhancement of habitat for moose
20 and so forth. But here you're displacing the bears and you're
21 going to have increased conflict between black bears themselves,
22 increased conflicts with blacks and browns and so forth. We
23 recognize that there may be a problem -- the paper recognizes
24 there may be a problem, and it's just left hanging. So I was
25 asking for additional discussion on these points.

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 MR. ARMINSKI: Is there -- are there any
2 areas that Fish & Game and Fish & Wildlife Service recognize as
3 being important to black bear denning that are, you know, in immi-
4 nent danger of being developed, you know, through your projects
5 review?

6 MR. HOSKINS: I'll have to -- I don't know.

7 MR. ROSENBERG: Yes, I don't know either.
8 I think in a very generic sense there are geographical areas or
9 habitat types that are known to be better than others within the
10 project -- not within the -- you know, within the Susitna basin,
11 say downstream or what have you. And I think those can be iden-
12 tified, the types of habitats that, say, black bears prefer to
13 den in. But -- and along those lines, that's where I think the
14 emphasis should be on avoiding those areas where bear denning
15 concentrations are known to occur, avoiding --

16 MR. FAIRBANKS: Um-hm, you mean for moose
17 management. Is that what you --

18 MR. ROSENBERG: -- Well, just -- I mean
19 avoiding them by maybe actually identifying those areas and using
20 those -- avoiding other disturbances, not just project distur-
21 bances. I mean using those areas as mitigation, perhaps as
22 replacement lands, identifying areas where black bear denning
23 concentrations are known to occur, and establishing those as
24 replacement lands for mitigation for black bear.

25 MR. FAIRBANKS: You mean simply protecting

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 those lands?

2 MR. ROSENBERG: Protecting those areas.

3 I don't know what those areas are.

4 MR. ARMINSKI: I know we've talked about
5 this in the past and, you know, it seems that there's very little
6 likelihood that at least on state lands the State's going to fore-
7 go its opportunity to dispose of lands. And I'm not sure how
8 the federal government would restrict some of its programs for
9 this. Is there anything that we can identify to compensate for
10 this if we can't mitigate it in kind? Is there something that --

11 MR. FAIRBANKS: That's a possibility, the
12 denning thing, but in general I think black bear denning is pretty
13 dispersed. I'm not aware of any -- any areas where there's a
14 real concentration, and if there were, you almost have to go out
15 and radio collar, you know, hundreds of black bears to find out
16 where they're all denning. The dens aren't really obvious places,
17 except for the ones that we know about in the project area,
18 because that's where we've done a lot of radio collaring. But
19 generally the denning -- you know, they den just about anywhere
20 where there's a good tree root ball that they can get underneath,
21 or a cave, a natural cave. I mean, there are some places maybe
22 where brown bear denning could be protected, possibility.

23 MR. BEDARD: Wasn't there an area in the
24 Poise (ph) Creek area that was identified as a little more heavy
25 in black bear population than in the overall area?

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 MR. FAIRBANKS: Well, there's more black
2 bears down that way because there's more forested habitat, there's
3 more black bear habitat when you get down that far.

4 MR. BEDARD: Is that kind of what you're
5 looking at, that kind of area?

6 MR. HOSKINS: If we're up the rope right
7 here and can't come up with an area to be set aside because of
8 the lack of knowledge of where the bears den and so forth, I think
9 the paper should reflect this. And if your recommendation is
10 for mitigation of out-of-kind or something that provides benefit
11 to another species, that should be stated in here as such.

12 MR. ARMINSKI: I'm really afraid that we're
13 not, both in a practical sense of identifying denning habitat
14 and just being able to preserve those areas, I mean, from develop-
15 ment, you know, I think we're going to have a real hard time.

16 MR. HOSKINS: It can very well be, and you're
17 probably right, Tom, but I think if that's the case, the paper
18 should reflect that. And just say, "agencies, this is the way
19 we look at it, and now it's just a matter of everybody's biting
20 the bullet, including the bears, and this is what we anticipate
21 to happen".

22 MR. ROSENBERG: Yes, I agree with what you're
23 saying, and I agree with what you're saying on -- that these den
24 sites are rather dispersed and essentially opportunistic in a
25 lot of ways as to where or when they might be. But --

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 8th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 MR. HOSKINS: We're going to run into this
2 same sort of problem on these next papers that we're looking at
3 today, the same type of thing. And we have to get more input,
4 I feel, from the Power Authority right now on just what the posi-
5 tion is, because we're left hanging.

6 MR. ROSENBERG: But if we can identify some
7 specific areas, and I don't know yet how big, how small, perhaps
8 when they're spoken of in terms of whatever, land purchase, land
9 exchange, land reclassification and so on and so forth, perhaps
10 if they're -- if they're a little bit more specific and not so
11 generic, something can be worked out. So I think it just is worth
12 the time to perhaps try and identify some areas and see if it's
13 possible to identify some areas first, and then take it from there
14 and see where the -- what those areas are, where those areas are,
15 and it may be possible to pursue it to the next step.

16 MR. ARMINSKI: What kind of level of detail
17 would you be happy with on identifying areas? You know, take
18 for example the brown books that the Fish & Game Department's
19 prepared, and everybody recognizes those things are pretty shaky,
20 but, I mean, now, there's one level of detail. We can talk to
21 area biologists and maybe get -- of course, they're the ones that
22 drew the circles on those maps to begin with, but we may be able
23 to get a little better level of detail.

24 MR. ROSENBERG: Didn't some of these studies
25 go to downstream areas? Weren't they doing -- Fish & Game right

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 now doing radiotelemetry studies on -- in locating den sites out
2 of the immediate impoundment area?

3 MR. FAIRBANKS: Yeah, they've done some work
4 in the middle river zone, plus there's -- I think they've iden-
5 tified -- you know, there's probably five or six or seven den
6 sites identified down there.

7 MR. ROSENBERG: My point now is just mostly
8 to look into it, just explore the possibility for that approach,
9 and then see where that takes us. And that -- In the same regard
10 on the mitigation measures, number -- the ninth one, it says that
11 "Major project-related ground activity will be prohibited within
12 a quarter mile of all known active bear dens between September
13 15th and May 15th". As determined by what? Will there be a moni-
14 toring program or further studies, further radiotelemetry studies,
15 that will locate more bear dens, or are we just going to go with
16 what we know right now at this point in time? What's going to
17 -- when are we going to draw the line on --

18 MR. FAIRBANKS: Yes, I think that's --

19 MR. ROSENBERG: -- How's that going to be,
20 you know, identify all these active bear dens, or have they been
21 identified and we're going to leave it at that, or what?

22 MR. FAIRBANKS: Yeah, well, the detailed
23 aspects of the monitoring program in that respect haven't been
24 developed yet. I don't --

25 MR. ROSENBERG: -- No, but they will be --

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 MR. FAIRBANKS: -- Yeah --

2 MR. ROSENBERG: -- that will be part of it,
3 is all I'm getting at.

4 MR. LOWENFELS: To identify more sites, I
5 guess, is the question.

6 MR. ROSENBERG: Yes, I -- is there going
7 to be a monitoring program that will set up some scheme of things
8 where if more sites will be identified, money will be set aside
9 for radiotelemetry studies, so on and so forth.

10 MR. FAIRBANKS: Additional what?

11 MR. ROSENBERG: I'm sorry, money will be
12 set aside for radiotelemetry studies to locate more sites. Will
13 that be part of the monitoring program?

14 MR. ARMINSKI: Well, it would seem to me
15 that -- just on the basis of what you said, you know, and Randy
16 said, that bears are fairly opportunis -- can't say that.

17 MR. LOWENFELS: Opportunistic.

18 MR. ARMINSKI: But they're -- you know, the
19 den sites aren't going to be the same year after year. And, you
20 know, perhaps, you know, visual survey or something, each den --

21 MR. FAIRBANKS: Yes, there's no easy way
22 of doing it. That's the reason I'm hesitating. We haven't really
23 -- there's no easy way. It's an expensive proposition if you're
24 going to continue to monitor radio collared bears, you know, for
25 the life of the project. That's why I -- I doubt that it would

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 be -- we could justify doing -- continuing the radio collar bears
2 and monitor them throughout the years just to identify den sites.
3 But I think that there would be some level of monitoring of radio
4 collared bears at least during the initial years of the project
5 anyway to find out what's going to happen -- what's happening
6 to the black bear population in the area, and along with that
7 we would be identifying additional den sites. There is a fair
8 amount of reuse, though, of -- you know, in the case of black
9 bears, so that the dens that have been identified very likely
10 are going to be used again unless they collapse or something even-
11 tually. So that those, in conjunction with some level of moni-
12 toring later on, would produce some, you know, additional den
13 sites. But there's a limit and there's a point of diminishing
14 returns there where you keep pumping a lot of money into moni-
15 toring but you're only going to be turning up, you know, one addi-
16 tional den a year or something.

17 MR. ROSENBERG: I just wanted -- I hate to
18 say "more specifics", but --

19 MR. FAIRBANKS: Yeah, I know what you mean.

20 MR. ROSENBERG: Some -- something there where
21 it just further defines what at least will be looked at as far
22 as how we're going to draw that line, again, as to where we're
23 going to continue studies and where we're not.

24 MR. FAIRBANKS: Right.

25 MR. BEDARD: I had one comment from Page 6.

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 Is it possible that in the impoundment zone of the two dam pro-
2 jects that the dens that would be impounded by water at the mean
3 high water level, is it possible for those dens to be completely
4 plugged in and closed up? My personal fear is that it could occur
5 where bears might go into those dens at the lower -- lowest water
6 levels, have their cubs in there, and when the waters start rising
7 you know, you get a flash flood or a high temperature on the gla-
8 cier, it melts off, comes down and raises three feet within a
9 couple of hours, you're going to wipe out some bear population.
10 And to discourage that, would it be a good mitigative measure
11 to plug those things while they're clearing --

12 MR. FAIRANKS: Yes, in fact I think that
13 was -- that was something that was just -- we either intended
14 to incorporate in here or it did just barely get incorporated
15 right at the last minute before it was mailed, but that's a good
16 point, and that's why we calculated the -- estimated the number
17 of dens that might be in that situation. I think there's a table
18 in here which indicates -- Table 1, which indicates approximately
19 when -- what season of the year each den would be inundated for
20 that reason. I think we looked at -- because of the fact that
21 the filling mostly occurs during the summertime, there would be
22 a minority of dens that would run that risk. But -- and we didn't
23 feel that -- the ones that may be flooded in the winter, the
24 clearing would've taken place prior to that, so the -- you know,
25 the habitat is going to be -- not look so great to a black bear

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 anymore once it's, you know, a big clearcut. Although bears do
2 -- or, black bears have been known to den in clearcuts too. So
3 I think that's a good suggestion, is that in addition to just
4 clearing the area around the den, the den should just be destroyed.

5 MR. BEDARD: That's what I'm getting at,
6 just plug it up or otherwise make it nonusable.

7 MR. ARMINSKI: Well, if we're going to des-
8 troy dens, can we establish dens?

9 MR. FAIRBANKS: Well, that's -- I guess that's
10 always a possibility. I don't know. You know, you'd have to
11 find -- to be effective, you'd have to find an area where den
12 sites are limiting. And that's not going to be an easy proposi-
13 tion. But it's a possibility. I don't know that anybody's ever
14 done it, I've never seen --

15 MR. HOSKINS: You'd have to have a very big
16 one.

17 MR. LOWENFELS: I was going to say, my mother
18 was a den mother once.

19 MR. THRALL: Would a -- say, a program to
20 look at, in an experimental way, look at artificial den sites,
21 would that be a -- considered a mitigation?

22 MR. HOSKINS: Not to me it wouldn't.

23 MR. THRALL: We'd go out there with some
24 styrofoam dens.

25 MR. ROACH: I have the same comment I had

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 before on Page ii, Item 2, and over on Page 8, Item 2, and that's
2 about the side borrow. Somebody else made a comment a while ago
3 that there's borrow pits all along there -- gravel all along there.
4 But if you take a look at the gravel pits around Cantwell and
5 over around Paxson and the ones that we know of along the Denali
6 Highway, most of them are just a thin veneer of gravel overlying
7 glacial till. And so what you're -- what you're going to have
8 to do when you get in and open up these areas, you're going to
9 have to have big areas to open up, because the gravel some places
10 is only four or five feet thick. So that's why we'd like the
11 statements -- both of these statements two -- both the statement
12 Number 2's changed where that you're going to allow gravel pits.
13 That was a big problem, by the way, when the DOT built the Parks
14 Highway, in some sections of those -- of that highway was done
15 by consultants and gravel pits were located from aerial photo-
16 graphs, and in some cases the quantity of gravel that was esti-
17 mated just wasn't there.

18 MR. THRALL: Would a statement to the effect
19 -- we would still like to make the attempt to use side borrow,
20 I think, as possible. But we would recognize in this paper that
21 where that's not possible we will have to have borrow pits. Is
22 that --

23 MR. ROACH: Yes, this is strange coming from
24 me, because I've always advocated in our own department we use
25 side borrow if possible. It's just not possible to do a 40 --

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 I don't think, a 46-mile project without going to some side bor-
2 rows, especially in this area up here where you know -- in areas
3 that you know of that the gravel deposits aren't very thick.
4 If you drive along the Denali, you know, you may wonder why they
5 got so many gravel pits, one here and there and there, and that's
6 one of the reasons, a lot of these pits are -- have only got a
7 couple feet of gravel -- the gravel's only a couple feet thick.

8 MR. FAIRBANKS: Okay, I think that's the
9 way it should be stated, is that the intent would be to use side
10 borrow as much as possible, but I know there have been some sites
11 identified in the license application, at least in a tentative
12 manner, for pits, and this summer, if things go according to plan,
13 we'll be out in the field and including doing some drilling,
14 looking for, you know, sites on the ground. So hopefully we can
15 pin it down, then, after this summer.

16 MR. ARMINSKI: You know, something else is
17 I guess we had always envisioned that after the project was con-
18 structed that we would turn this road over to DOT. And you guys
19 would have to maintain it. And that's not -- I mean, our money
20 all comes from the same place, but, you know, if maintenance --
21 having material sites for maintenance is really a concern, then
22 we need -- I mean, in addition to construction as a concern, we
23 need to get together and identify what you think the best thing
24 is to do.

25 MR. ROACH: You need -- you need pits for

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 maintenance. Where these roadside borrow areas work best are
2 in areas where you've got rolling terrain and you've got thick
3 -- or, a thick gravel deposit, or you're in bedrock. And in areas
4 where you've got bed -- where you're going over a hill and you're
5 in bedrock, they work real well for a side borrow, but the only
6 catch there is it costs a lot more money to excavate bedrock,
7 because it has to be drilled and shot rather than picking up oil
8 -- gravel.

9 MR. ARMINSKI: Any more comments on --

10 MR. ROSENBERG: Yeah. I saw the statement
11 on the top of Page 4, and just -- and the statement on Page 7,
12 in the second paragraph, as a little bit contradictory. It says,
13 "Black bears" -- on Page 4 at the top, the sentence, "Black bears
14 will tend to concentrate in the limited remaining habitat areas
15 at lower elevations along the impoundment shores", and then on
16 Page 7, "After filling, it is likely that few black bears will
17 forage or den along the Susitna River between Tsusena Creek and
18 the Oshetna River", that's the top of the second paragraph. And
19 maybe it's just that the time frames we're talking about are dif-
20 ferent, maybe that's all. If we're talking about different time
21 periods then maybe it's not -- maybe it's not a contradiction,
22 but --

23 MR. FAIRBANKS: Yes, I think the --

24 MR. ROSENBERG: -- it's not explained.

25 MR. FAIRBANKS: -- sentence on Page 4 is

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 8th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 referring to like immediately after inundation, bears will tend
2 to concentrate on the limited remaining habitat. And then it
3 goes on to say after the short term increase in density, you know,
4 the population will decrease. I think that's the intent there,
5 maybe we could clarify that.

6 MR. ROSENBERG: Yeah, because the other --
7 on the second -- on Page 7 is says "after filling", which also
8 sounds rather immediate.

9 MR. FAIRBANKS: Yeah, long-term versus short-
10 term.

11 MR. ROSENBERG: Yeah, that needs to be a
12 little bit better clarified. I was somewhat confused on Page
13 6, I was somewhat confused with just the wording in the last half
14 of that second paragraph versus what it says at the top -- what
15 it says at the top of the page in the first paragraph. I just
16 wasn't quite sure what it was saying in that, to tell you the
17 truth.

18 MR. FAIRBANKS: You're talking about the
19 last sentence in the second paragraph?

20 MR. ROSENBERG: Yeah, the last couple of
21 sentences in the second paragraph.

22 MR. FAIRBANKS: Page 6?

23 MR. ROSENBERG: Yeah. And then -- but in
24 reference to what it says in the top paragraph. I can't remember,
25 I just wrote down that I was confused by it, and I don't really

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 remember now --

2 MR. ARMINSKI: I think it says that these
3 dens are not going to be inundated but the disturbance will cause
4 them not to be used, and then after the disturbance ceases then
5 the bears will be -- reuse these.

6 MR. ROSENBERG: Okay. Yeah, okay, I'll re-
7 read it.

8 MR. FAIRBANKS: I think I understand what
9 it's saying.

10 MR. ROSENBERG: Then I also question the
11 effect that the impoundment might have as a barrier. We have
12 144 documented crossings and something like 15 to 20% of the bears
13 were radio marked, which these were -- these crossings were docu-
14 mented. So there are quite a few crossings of that area,
15 apparently. I don't know, is there anything from the literature
16 to support the statement that there really shouldn't be much
17 effect on bears crossing an impoundment as wide as Watana?

18 MR. FAIRBANKS: Well, certainly there is
19 documentation that bears can swim that far, and they are good
20 swimmers. I guess the point was that, you know, it's probably
21 going to be fairly minor compared to the other impacts, the pro-
22 blem with getting across. In some cases, I think the reservoir
23 is going to improve -- make it easier for bears to get across,
24 especially Devil Canyon. Most of the Devil Canyon reservoir where
25 it's fairly narrow and still water, and it's -- more black bears

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 are in the vicinity of Devil Canyon reservoir, as you go further
2 west the number of black bears increases. So, you know, it's
3 going to be a problem, but I guess we didn't feel that it was
4 going to be a significant population decimating factor, one that
5 would reduce the population over and above what the inundation
6 will do already.

7 MR. BEDARD: That particular area, the
8 Oshetna area, there's quite a few rapids in that particular area.
9 In my opinion, knowing how black bears forage the Kennebeck (ph)
10 River, which is much wider in some places than the Oshetna will
11 be after impoundment, the waters are going to be more stable and
12 it'll probably be much earlier for the bears to cross. This is
13 my own opinion.

14 MR. ROSENBERG: In certain portions, perhaps,
15 yeah.

16 MR. ARMINSKI: Any other comments?

17 MR. ROSENBERG: Yes, I've got -- I'll keep
18 going for a little bit. On Page 7, the second paragraph, the
19 last sentence, "The application of more stringent black bear har-
20 vest regulations in the immediate project area may be advisable
21 to alleviate the combined impacts of decreased habitat and
22 increased hunting". To implement something like that does require
23 dollars for monitoring and enforcement, and I just want to be
24 sure that that's -- if something like this is proposed in the
25 mitigation plan, that you're aware of the need for funding,

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 monitoring and enforcement costs.

2 MR. FAIRBANKS: Well, this isn't really being
3 proposed as part of the mitigation plan, because we're -- we are
4 assuming we can't propose --

5 MR. ROSENBERG: -- Yeah, the regulation is
6 a whole other issue.

7 MR. FAIRBANKS: -- regulation as mitigation.
8 We're just simply stating that it may actually be necessary --
9 well, it won't be necessary, but it may be -- may be something
10 that should be done in order to minimize the total impact to the
11 bears.

12 MR. ROSENBERG: Yes, I just wanted to be
13 aware that it does require -- there is costs involved with that
14 sort of thing, to be done effectively.

15 MR. ARMINSKI: Bruce?

16 MR. FAIRBANKS: Yes, I guess --

17 MR. BEDARD: Go ahead.

18 MR. FAIRBANKS: Yes, I was just going to
19 say that I -- we haven't -- to date we really haven't considered
20 that the Power Authority would be responsible for providing addi-
21 tional funding because of additional regulations needing to be
22 implemented. That's maybe a general question that maybe needs
23 to be addressed at some point. If this is just one case, there's
24 going to be others.

25 MR. ARMINSKI: I guess our position would

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 be that, you know, we would seek to minimize the loss by the means
2 we've talked about, replacement habitat or whatever.

3 MR. ROSENBERG: But if that couldn't be done,
4 or if it was shown that, you know, that the monitoring program
5 -- subsequent monitoring program showed that that was not working,
6 and therefore the Board of Game or what have you is forced to
7 implement regulations that did require additional expenses for
8 enforcement and monitoring of those regulations.

9 MR. ARMINSKI: I don't know if it's our posi-
10 tion to fund Fish & Wildlife to -- that's DOT/PF's -- or, Public
11 Safety, Fish & Wildlife, to enforce regulations. But I think
12 certainly we could -- we're going to be monitoring anyway to
13 ascertain whether or not these impacts take place.

14 MR. ROSENBERG: I think that will need to
15 be -- maybe we should discuss that later on at some time and go
16 into that a little more. Okay, on Page 8, mitigation measures,
17 Number 1, I just think it's fair to say that rather that "Impound-
18 ment clearing will be conducted in a manner to minimize pre-
19 reservoir-filling habitat loss", essentially impoundment clearing
20 will delay habitat loss, is what it will do. And over the long
21 term it's really not a very significant -- go ahead.

22 MR. LATKA: Well, I -- have you decided,
23 then, to clear the impoundment areas? I'd never really heard
24 for sure that that was going to happen.

25 MR. FAIRBANKS: Yeah, I think that's the

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 8th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 current plan, although it hasn't -- a detailed reservoir clearing
2 plan has not been developed.

3 MR. ARMINSKI: That's in the works right
4 now.

5 MR. ROSENBERG: Okay, number -- the fifth
6 one I think we've covered already, Hank covered that and Randy
7 talked about it. The eighth one, Number 8, line one, two, three,
8 says, ". . . prohibiting hunting by the public or employees within
9 the project boundary -- within the project boundary . . ." I
10 don't think the Power Authority can do that, prohibit public hun-
11 ting.

12 MR. ARMINSKI: Within the -- within the pro-
13 ject boundaries we certainly can.

14 MR. THRALL: That's a very limited area.
15 They can't go in the basin or in the project area, but within
16 the boundaries of the project itself, I think they can.

17 MR. FAIRBANKS: Would include the shoreline
18 of the reservoir.

19 MR. THRALL: In other words, you're --

20 MR. ARMINSKI: It may not even be that, you
21 know, we would preclude hunting in the entire project boundary.
22 For example, you know, the reservoir's 40 miles long. If our
23 workers are just in the camp area working on diversion tunnels,
24 there's probably no hazard to the health and safety of workers
25 to have hunters hunting 10 miles away or something like that,

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 you know.

2 MR. BEDARD: There's another thing you can
3 add to that, that in the event the State can't do it, at least
4 on the lands that are public surrounding the two-dam project,
5 the Natives can.

6 MR. ROSENBERG: When we're talking about
7 the project boundary, we're talking about a few hundred feet up
8 from --

9 MR. ARMINSKI: Yeah, it's that line that --

10 MR. ROSENBERG: Oh, okay, yeah.

11 MR. THRALL: The biggest part of the project
12 boundary, other than the inundation zone, would be, you know,
13 in areas where you'd obviously prohibit hunting, would be the
14 camps --

15 MR. ROSENBERG: -- Sure --

16 MR. THRALL: -- and in the construction areas
17 themselves. And obviously the Power Authority can control that
18 area, and I'm sure they can keep people from coming and hunting.

19 MR. FAIRBANKS: And along the access road.

20 MR. THRALL: And along the access road, to
21 some degree.

22 MR. ROSENBERG: I just -- I just wasn't aware
23 that that could be done.

24 MR. THRALL: That's not to say the whole
25 project area, just sort -- maybe one thing we need sometime to

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 develop is a set of definitions for the project boundary, project
2 area. I think we went through this once before and then they
3 got lost.

4 MR. LOWENFELS: We're just waiting for the
5 Native land status before we can finalize that.

6 MR. BEDARD: So are we.

7 MR. ARMINSKI: So are they.

8 MR. ROSENBERG: If you can do that, fine.
9 I didn't know that that could be done, that you could prohibit
10 public hunting, other than within -- around buildings and roads.

11 MR. HOSKINS: Randy, on that --

12 MR. ROSENBERG: -- That's all that I have.

13 MR. HOSKINS: On a couple of these you've
14 mentioned state regulations pertaining to aerial hunting or some-
15 thing like this. You might want to also include the federal regu-
16 lations, the airborne hunting act, which restricts harassment
17 of animals by aircraft.

18 MR. FAIRBANKS: Good point.

19 MR. ARMINSKI: Bruce?

20 MR. BEDARD: Another point also, on the
21 federal lands, unless they've changed the regulations, on Page
22 7, Item 12, you've got 1,000 feet above ground level. On the
23 federal land, I believe it has to be 1500 feet. Am I wrong?

24 MR. HOSKINS: I think it's pretty much a
25 project-specific thing. Thinking along the pipeline and some

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 of these others, it depends on what species are there and what
2 values and so forth. I don't think there is a specific law.

3 MR. BEDARD: Well, I was reading some regula-
4 tions over at BLM when I was over there for that agency meeting
5 they had, and I ran across a regulation that quoted 1500 feet,
6 and it wasn't specific to any species, just said where wildlife
7 are known to be in an area. They prefer a 1500 foot altitude.

8 MR. HOSKINS: It may be something they pre-
9 fer, I don't --

10 MR. BEDARD: -- I was just wondering if that
11 should be looked into and addressed.

12 MR. ARMINSKI: Okay, well, we can look into
13 that. Okay, let's go on to W-3. It's basically the same as W-2
14 but relates to brown bear. Randy, are you going to cover that
15 one?

16 MR. FAIRBANKS: Yeah, sure. This is very
17 similar, again. Brown bear field studies conducted primarily
18 by ADF&G provided the major source of information, along with
19 open scientific literature. The paper again basically concludes
20 the same sort of thing, that there will be a loss of spring for-
21 aging habitat and a local reduction of moose numbers. Those will
22 probably combine to reduce brown bear numbers, along with probably
23 a greater hunter harvest, which is really addressed in a separate
24 paper. And the same sort of things are proposed for mitigation
25 measures again. We don't know of a good way of enhancing brown

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8691

1 bear habitat, although in this case brown bears are probably likely
2 to more directly benefit from moose habitat enhancement than black
3 bears are, although it's hard to take too much credit for that
4 for brown bears.

5 MR. ROSENBERG: Well, a lot of that too is
6 just -- it's a seasonal enhancement.

7 MR. FAIRBANKS: Yeah, it is, right. Some-
8 what --

9 MR. ROSENBERG: -- And so if a brown bear
10 is fat and happy in one season but starving to death in another,
11 it won't do any good.

12 MR. FAIRBANKS: Although, you know, moose
13 do provide a proportion of brown bear diets throughout the year.

14 MR. ROSENBERG: But that may not be limiting --

15 MR. FAIRBANKS: -- The biggest part is during
16 June.

17 MR. ROSENBERG: -- to the brown bears.

18 MR. FAIRBANKS: Right, exactly. So, yeah,
19 I don't -- I think the key point here is that out of kind -- that's
20 what the paper says, that out of kind enhancement, habitat
21 enhancement, and preservation of forage habitats are the only
22 measures that we know of there. And the key area that we're
23 seeking to develop some agreements are on there is the Prairie
24 Creek area there, which everybody agrees is an important brown
25 bear habitat.

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 MR. ROSENBERG: Which -- Which was -- my
2 main comment was on this is that that wasn't mentioned in here.
3 A number of -- on the fifth mitigation measure, which is iden-
4 tical to the one for black bears except the idea of -- no mention
5 -- it's no specific mention of replacement lands or Prairie Creek
6 is in here. I'd like to see that.

7 MR. FAIRBANKS: Okay, that was just an over-
8 sight.

9 MR. ROSENBERG: I'd like to see that in here
10 somewhere.

11 MR. FAIRBANKS: Because that is in the posi-
12 tion statement. And preservation of important habitat, that was
13 -- should be in there.

14 MR. ROSENBERG: Yeah, we'd like to see
15 Prairie Creek, too, specifically stated in the mitigation measures
16 that that will be a goal.

17 MR. FAIRBANKS: The paper on -- I think it's
18 W-17/18, mitigation measures -- or, compensation measures paper
19 will address this issue more directly, talk about habitat enhance-
20 ment and compensation lands and replacement lands and preservation
21 of like Prairie Creek area. We still can't commit to anything
22 on Prairie Creek, except to say that that's -- you know, our goal
23 is to be able to provide some preservation there. We're working
24 on developing agreement with the CIRI villages and CIRI corpora-
25 tion.

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 MR. ROSENBERG: Well, Prairie Creek, yeah,
2 could be the -- could be the goal. I agree you can't.

3 MR. FAIRBANKS: Right.

4 MR. ROSENBERG: And then some of the same
5 comments apply from the last one as far as the whole discussion
6 we had on active -- known active bear dens.

7 MR. FAIRBANKS: Okay.

8 MR. ROSENBERG: And also there's -- there's
9 not a lot of discussion on the impact of improved access by
10 individuals other than hunters. And its effects on bears.

11 MR. FAIRBANKS: Individuals other than
12 hunters?

13 MR. ROSENBERG: Hunters. There'll be im-
14 proved access and a lot of other people may be going into the
15 area by whatever means and for whatever reasons. That could also
16 have an impact on bears.

17 MR. FAIRBANKS: Yeah, although we feel that,
18 you know, the impact of hunting is going to be definitely the
19 primary factor there. If there wasn't going to be any hunting
20 along the access road, I think the impact of people hiking and
21 recreating in the area would be pretty low, and there's a fair
22 amount of evidence to that.

23 MR. ROSENBERG: I think it's just worthy
24 of mentioning that there might be some impacts from that.

25 MR. FAIRBANKS: Sure.

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 MR. ROSENBERG: We're getting at -- I'm get-
2 ting at cumulative impact, once again, and I just think it's worth
3 -- when you start adding things up, it all counts, to a degree.
4 It has to be -- the overall impacts have to be assessed along
5 those lines. And on Page 2, the top paragraph, one, two, third
6 line, says, "Construction of and travel on the proposed access
7 roads should not affect brown bear denning activity." Do we have
8 any documentation that that area is not used by brown bears or
9 is used by brown bears? It's my understanding it just wasn't
10 really studied or looked at in the first place.

11 MR. FAIRBANKS: Yeah, well, a significant
12 portion of it was studied, not -- I guess not the entire -- the
13 entire access route. Now, there have been radio collared bears
14 -- some of the radio collared bears have covered the entire route,
15 but the southern portion and probably the southern half, I believe
16 have been looked at pretty intensively, but the northern half
17 has not. And those dens that have been discovered in the range
18 of the Chulitna hills, I think -- yeah, the Chulitna hills up
19 there, and I think the closest one was one and a half miles from
20 the proposed route. But, yeah, the northern -- it should probably
21 be pointed out that the northern portion of the route has not
22 been as intensively looked at as the southern half of the route.

23 MR. ROSENBERG: Because I believe that there
24 is some good den habitat along the northern half.

25 MR. FAIRBANKS: Yeah. Although it -- the

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 access road starts following the railroad (ph), though, on the
2 northern half, it starts taking it further away from the denning
3 habitat, but it's close.

4 MR. HOSKINS: Randy, a couple points. On
5 Page 1, again, make note of the federal airborne hunting act
6 restrictions under present knowledge.

7 MR. FAIRBANKS: Okay.

8 MR. HOSKINS: On Page 2, the second para-
9 graph, reference to my statement that brown bears tolerated con-
10 struction activities well at Terror Lake on Kodiak. Keep in mind
11 you're trying to extrapolate between two different populations
12 of animals. In my opinion, the Interior bears are much more
13 intolerant of almost every human activity than the bears are on
14 Kodiak. So don't extrapolate too much from the observations on
15 Kodiak bears. And finally, the -- on Page 4 you discuss the like-
16 lihood of increased competition and social strife between bears,
17 and what are APA's plans to monitor the impacts to brown bear
18 populations once construction begins? You have a mitigation mea-
19 sure that will discuss monitoring the den sites, and I want to
20 know if you have anything else planned.

21 MR. FAIRBANKS: Well, the specifics haven't
22 been developed there either. That will come out in the mitigation
23 plan this summer. But there will be some -- some degree of moni-
24 toring of brown bears for sure.

25 MR. ARMINSKI: Other comments on W-3?

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 MR. ROACH: I have the same comment I had
2 before, Randy. It's on Item 2 on 11 and Item 2 on Page 5.

3 MR. FAIRBANKS: Okay.

4 MR. ROSENBERG: And on Page 5, the third
5 item, that "Bears are typically attracted to revegetated sites
6 by the high productivity and early availability of spring forage".
7 Is there much documentation for that and the types of revegetation
8 that we're talking about, will that be beneficial to bears in
9 the short term or in the long term, or what types of revegeta
10 -- do we know yet what types of revegetation, really?

11 MR. FAIRBANKS: All right, I think that can
12 be clarified. Documentation can be provided there.

13 MR. ROSENBERG: Oh, and -- one more thing.
14 On Page 6, Number 9, the dates for prohibiting major project-
15 related ground activity can be changed to between November first
16 and April first.

17 MR. FAIRBANKS: Okay.

18 MR. ROSENBERG: If everybody else agrees.
19 Right now it says September 15th and May 15th.

20 MR. FAIRBANKS: All right.

21 MR. ARMINSKI: Okay, W-4.

22 MR. THRALL: Tom, I think we've got some
23 more comments.

24 MR. ARMINSKI: Oh, sorry. Leroy?

25 MR. LATKA: No.

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 MR. ARMINSKI: Bruce?

2 MR. BEDARD: No, I'm on W-4 too.

3 MR. ARMINSKI: Okay, let's go. This is sig-
4 nificance of habitat reduction for middle basin furbearers and
5 birds, the proposed mitigation measures. And our position is that
6 impacts on most of those furbearers and birds that do not use
7 heavily forested habitats would not be significant. Impacts on
8 forest-dwelling and other species will be reduced through imple-
9 mentation of the mitigation measures and partial compensation
10 will be provided through in-kind or out-of-kind habitat enhance-
11 ment or preservation of important habitats. There'll be moni-
12 toring to verify the expectations and additional mitigation mea-
13 sures will be instituted if necessary.

14 MR. FAIRBANKS: Okay, this again is basically
15 the same thing, same spiel. Furbearer and -- data sources were
16 furbearer and bird field studies in the project area conducted
17 by -- primarily by Phil Gipson, Brine Kessel, and the ADF&G for
18 the wolf and wolverine studies, and the open scientific literature
19 on these species. Again the basic conclusions are that inundation
20 will reduce available habitat for furbearers depending on forested
21 habitats, especially species like marten, which it's estimated
22 they'll lose about 7% of the available habitat above -- upstream
23 of Gold Creek in the Susitna basin. Mink and otter will also
24 -- the habitat will also be reduced throughout the impoundment
25 zones. And, you know, habitat for forest-dwelling birds in

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 particular such as, you know, spruce grouse, woodpeckers and
2 various passerines, will also be considerably reduced in the upper
3 basin. Again, a variety of mitigation measures were presented
4 to reduce or minimize or delay impacts, and the residual impacts,
5 the intention is to provide at least partial compensation through
6 in-kind -- in this case in-kind or out-of-kind enhancement or
7 again through preservation of important habitat.

8 MR. ARMINSKI: Leroy?

9 MR. LATKA: On Page iv, Number 9, and on
10 Page 15, Number 9, basically talks about slough enhancement mea-
11 sures will also benefit muskrat, mink and otter and may provide,
12 et cetera. We just wanted to say that I think that'll also bene-
13 fit moose, and that might be a way to punch out a few acres off
14 our card, you should include moose there.

15 MR. FAIRBANKS: That's a point. The degree
16 to which we'll actually attempt the slough enhancement is still
17 up in the air, and that's one thing that's being looked at right
18 now, will be coming out in a mitigation plan. It was one thing
19 that was proposed in the license application, but it's -- we're
20 recognizing that slough enhancement for salmon is going to come
21 first, and it may be feasible to provide some enhancement for
22 aquatic furbearers and maybe other species through that as well,
23 but that's just one of the options right now.

24 MR. ROSENBERG: I think that's a pretty mini-
25 mal area, too, in relation to moose. We're talking about forest

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 sloughs, you know, so . . .

2 MR. LATKA: I just thought I'd bring it up.

3 MR. ROACH: I have the same comment on iii,
4 Number 2, to reword that one. And then I have a comment on Page
5 12, Number 2, where you say "Habitat loss for all species will
6 be minimized through the use of side-borrow techniques for road
7 construction, dispose" --

8 MR. LOWENFELS: -- Depositing --

9 MR. ROACH: -- "depositing spoil in future
10 impoundment areas or depleted borrow sites". Might also want
11 to add you could put spoil adjacent to the roadway in some areas
12 to provide side support for the roads. It might cut down on the
13 length of haul you've got for the waste material and also put
14 it to good use.

15 MR. FAIRBANKS: Okay.

16 MR. ARMINSKI: Dan?

17 MR. ROSENBERG: How did you know?

18 MR. ARMINSKI: I knew.

19 MR. HOSKINS: This is the last paper? This
20 is the last paper?

21 MR. ARMINSKI: Yes, this is the last one.

22 I think Dan's got --

23 MR. ROSENBERG: I've got a few things. Under
24 the mitigation measures, the third one, which is back to revegeta-
25 tion and fertilization of disturbed sites. You know, what and

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 how -- or, what and how the effects of revegetation are going
2 to be will depend on, you know, what species the revegetation
3 will be good for and so on and so forth. So without having a
4 revegetation plan, without deciding specifically what type of
5 revegetation or what the revegetation will be targeted for, it's
6 difficult to say that that's going to minimize the period of
7 temporary habitat loss. I mean, it's certainly not -- by planting
8 an area to grasses you're certainly not going to minimize tem-
9 porary habitat loss to forest-dwelling birds.

10 MR. FAIRBANKS: No, but I guess the point
11 is being made there that, you know, it's going to be better than
12 bare dirt, probably.

13 MR. ROSENBERG: Well, for a lot of things,
14 I mean, it will be better --

15 MR. FAIRBANKS: -- The point is by revegeta-
16 tion we're not meaning necessarily planting or seeding with --
17 you know, it just simply means -- it's intended to be a general
18 term just to imply getting the area ready for re-establishment
19 of vegetation or, in some cases, seeding or planting may be
20 advisable or a necessary measure because of erosion problems.
21 But I think the --

22 MR. ROSENBERG: Well, I just don't --

23 MR. FAIRBANKS: The point is that these sites
24 would be -- revegetation activities would take place as soon as
25 the sites are not needed. That's the point.

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 8th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 MR. ROSENBERG: I'm all for revegetation,
2 I just question it will minimize the period of temporary habitat
3 loss. To what, or for what?

4 MR. THRALL: Maybe we can qualify it.

5 MR. ROSENBERG: In regard to the middle basin
6 furbearers and birds.

7 MR. THRALL: I think we just qualified it
8 for some species, but obviously revegetating an area provides
9 more habitat than --

10 MR. FAIRBANKS: -- Than a gravel pit.

11 MR. THRALL: -- than a gravel pit. We cer-
12 tainly can qualify that statement. It won't provide habitat for
13 everything.

14 MR. ROSENBERG: Number 2, you're getting
15 a lot of mileage out of -- pardon my choice of words -- out of
16 the side borrow technique, but you do have it down here twice.
17 2 and Number 8.

18 MR. LOWENFELS: Two sides.

19 MR. ROSENBERG: Two sides of the road.

20 MR. FAIRBANKS: Caught us.

21 MR. ROSENBERG: More of an editorial comment.

22 And I also question two wolverines that are going to be affected
23 by the project. How that was arrived at and --

24 MR. LATKA: What page it is on?

25 MR. ROSENBERG: Well, it just states in here

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 8th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 somewhere that only two wolverines will be adversely affected
2 by the project, I think, or the carrying --

3 MR. FAIRBANKS: I don't think it says that
4 two will be affected, it says that the carrying capacity will
5 be reduced by about two.

6 MR. ROSENBERG: Oh, okay.

7 MR. FAIRBANKS: I think a lot more than two
8 will be affected, but, you know, it's kind of hard to predict
9 wolverine impacts on a project like this, but based on home range
10 size of wolverines -- you know, we've just basically --

11 MR. ROSENBERG: Well, I think it's fair for
12 the paper to say it's hard to predict wolverine impacts and we
13 don't know how many will be affected. I think it's a little pre-
14 mature, maybe, based on the information to say that only two --
15 the carrying capacity for two wolverines -- the carrying capacity
16 will be reduced so two less wolverines will be able to be sup-
17 ported. It's sort of based on an acreage figure.

18 MR. FAIRBANKS: Right, based on their home
19 range --

20 MR. ROSENBERG: And of course it doesn't
21 really depend on acreage, it depends more on the type of habitat
22 that's available.

23 MR. THRALL: Well, I have a little problem
24 with that, because we have been -- there's an emphasis on trying
25 to be quantitative of predicted impacts in the degree you can.

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8691

1 And we always get very severely criticized -- well, not severely
2 criticized, we get criticized for, you know, being vague about
3 impacts. I think this two wolverine -- the carrying capacity
4 for two wolverine is just an attempt to put some level -- I don't
5 think we intend to say that only two wolverine are going to be
6 lost, but at least it puts it in perspective, and I think that's
7 the proper way to approach things where we can. And this is --
8 again, we can put some qualifying words in here to indicate that
9 we certainly aren't saying that that's a hard quantified number
10 that are going to be lost, but I think we should, wherever we
11 have this sort of information, I think we should present it,
12 because it gives everybody a better feel for what we're really
13 talking about. I just -- this happens to be one point of sensi-
14 tivity because I something think I get -- we get hit from both
15 sides on this. We're told to quantify things, but sometimes when
16 we do quantify things, you say, oh, well, you know, that's really
17 not true, it's going to be worse than that. We don't mean to
18 say that --

19 MR. ROSENBERG: Well, yeah, by saying worse
20 than that doesn't mean you can't -- that's not saying you shouldn't
21 quantify things. I'm -- All I'm saying is I don't agree with
22 your quantification, not that you shouldn't quantify things.

23 MR. THRALL: Well, it's just a method. I
24 mean, there's a certain home range size, certain acreage, I mean,
25 just -- you multiply it out and you take it for what it's worth.

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 Again, I say, we can put some qualifiers on there saying using
2 these --

3 MR. ROSENBERG: -- Yes, I think that's --

4 MR. THRALL: -- factor, that's what you'd
5 come up with.

6 MR. FAIRBANKS: Yeah, it does say that,
7 though, that that's what the estimate is based on. It's based
8 on the home range size of a wolverine, that if you used that as
9 the basis, then the carrying capacity would be reduced by about
10 two wolverine. But I think, you know, we could follow that with
11 another sentence stating that, you know, recognize that habitat
12 quality is important as well as quantity and it's very difficult
13 to assess that aspect of it.

14 MR. ARMINSKI: Bruce?

15 MR. BEDARD: I just had an overall comment
16 about it. I notice that throughout this whole paper it refers
17 to trapping as a main source of impact, and if access is made
18 more easy, trapping may occur, poaching may increase, hunting
19 may increase, and all these would have an impact on the wildlife.
20 Does it behoove the agencies to address the fact that they may
21 not have the regulatory authority to maybe control access, but
22 as well the law goes the private owner does. And you might look
23 at that as a mitigation with the private owners, what these agen-
24 cies would like to see, and see if the private owners are willing
25 to confer with some of you. That method could minimize a lot

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 8th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 of this impact I'm reading through this last paper.

2 MR. ARMINSKI: Hank?

3 MR. ROSENBERG: Are you saying that you think
4 that that will be the biggest impact?

5 MR. BEDARD: Well, I do know that, you know,
6 because there are differing Native entities that own the land
7 up there within the CIRI structure, I do know that certain land-
8 owners are saying they're not going to allow any ATV use, they
9 don't want any rockhounds up there, they may restrict hunting
10 by -- via permit, and these all will enhance some of these pro-
11 blems. But this could probably enhance even greater if you people
12 make aware what your concerns are and where you can't do it, maybe
13 through the effects of regulatory authority, we could do it as
14 an effort of a private landowner by requiring permits and limiting
15 trespass and things like this on areas of concern. But because
16 we have to address this with the different landowners, we might
17 be able to -- like Tyonek, for instance, they have 50,000 acres
18 up there, and Tyonek might be acceptable to most or all your plans.
19 Whereas Knik, who has almost a similar amount, may have different
20 opinions. So whatever they're agreeable to, at least it's a step
21 forward in minimizing some of this impact.

22 MR. ARMINSKI: Hank?

23 MR. HOSKINS: To paraphrase the APA's posi-
24 tion on Page 1, impacts on forest-dwelling species will be reduced
25 through mitigation measures and compensation, either by in-kind

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 or out-of-kind habitat enhancement or the preservation of impor-
2 tant habitats. This approach is supported by the Fish & Wildlife
3 Service. We concur with the treatment being afforded to wolf,
4 wolverine, beaver, muskrat, mink, otter, coyote and red fox within
5 the context of this paper. Our concern is with the other fur-
6 bearers, Pages 7 and 8, associated with coniferous climax forest
7 lands. Acknowledgement is offered that populations of weasel,
8 lynx and marten will be adversely impacted by vegetative clearing
9 and filling of the impoundments, but not mitigation measures are
10 presented. The statement that "evidence exists that marten are
11 tolerant of moderate levels of disturbance in areas adjacent to
12 logging operations" is irrelevant and has no bearing on the extent
13 of habitat destruction which is proposed. We suggest that the
14 investigation of compensation lands be undertaken by the Power
15 Authority. And Bruce's proposal is very apropos here. Our pre-
16 ference would be to preserve lands which are presently threatened
17 by development as the furbearer black bear habitat management
18 area. We hope the approach taken will be more innovative than
19 the typical out-of-kind habitat compensation of swapping units
20 of moose browse for spruce woodlands. Consider that the maximum
21 density of marten in optimal habitat is about four animals per
22 square mile. The minimum amount of habitat for consideration
23 would be approximately 35,000 acres as replacement for the number
24 of marten displaced by the project. So to summarize, I'm asking
25 the Power Authority to investigate replacement lands, and I think

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 the proposal that Bruce has to talk with the Native corporations
2 and see if they're willing to set aside areas as furbearer black
3 bear management areas, something like this is very appropriate.

4 MR. BEDARD: Yes, APA is doing that now,
5 to some extent, moose and other things. But we haven't got into
6 marten and other species yet.

7 MR. HOSKINS: Right.

8 MR. LOWENFELS: Is that it?

9 MR. ROSENBERG: I agree with Hank's statement
10 as far as that whole discussion on replacement lands that I talked
11 about earlier, too, with black bears.

12 MR. FAIRBANKS: It seems like only -- just
13 to -- Maybe we should drop that subject. But it seems like the
14 only option available to APA is going to be state -- or, private
15 lands, because the State, as we understand the directives we've
16 gotten from the State or will be getting, are that, you know,
17 this concept of replacement land is not going to be a feasible
18 concept on state-owned land. So it sounds like the option is
19 to essentially buy out development rights, purchase development
20 rights, or purchase land or lease land.

21 MR. ROSENBERG: Yes, what you're going to
22 get -- I guess it's in the mail.

23 MR. LATKA: Famous last words.

24 MR. ROSENBERG: The order or priorities for
25 replacement lands is going to be, one, purchase private lands,

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 two, purchase or reclassify borough lands, three, reclassify state
2 lands where existing classifications are incompatible with the
3 approved mitigation plan for the target species, and four, ex-
4 change state land for non-state land.

5 MR. ARMINSKI: Well, you know, I guess all
6 I've got to say is that, you know, when you talk about 35,000
7 acres, that's a township and a half, and, you know, if the State
8 -- I don't mean the Fish & Game Department, but I mean the whole
9 State thinks that it's in its best interest to buy up a township
10 and a half of development land so they can have this project,
11 I guess they'll do it. But, you know, it seems pretty unreason-
12 able to me.

13 MR. LATKA: Well, you can figure that 86%
14 of the classified state lands are already -- I think -- let me
15 see, I think it's 86%, I don't have the number in front of me,
16 but the lands classified in the Susitna plan are fish and -- fish
17 -- what do we call it, wildlife habitat. So it's -- the Susitna
18 basin is the most valuable land the State's got in the sense of
19 public use, not in the sense of Prudhoe Bay. And, you know, you
20 go in there and start talking, what, township and a half of --
21 we don't -- we haven't got that much left to --

22 MR. ARMINSKI: You've got to -- I mean,
23 you've really got to weigh what's in the public interest, I think.
24 I mean, you can't have -- you can't have everything. I don't
25 mean --

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 MR. HOSKINS: You can't have the animals
2 as long as you have people.

3 MR. ARMINSKI: Well, that's true.

4 MR. LATKA: Why don't we do this, before
5 we start discussing the paper, why don't you get the paper, and
6 -- because, I mean, we're -- I haven't even seen the final draft
7 since it was signed myself. Let's get it and then we can have
8 a meeting and talk about it instead of going --

9 MR. ARMINSKI: Yes.

10 MR. ROSENBERG: Yes, what you just said --
11 Leroy just said is a very misleading statement, but let's just
12 leave it at that.

13 MR. LATKA: Yes.

14 MR. LOWENFELS: Strike that statement about
15 misleading -- No.

16 MR. LATKA: Yes, I'd just as soon you didn't
17 put that in the notes.

18 MR. LOWENFELS: We'll strike the last
19 reference. Okay, that's it?

20 MR. ROSENBERG: Yeah, that's basically it.
21 I have a few other little comments, but they sort of pertain to
22 statements that I just think are a little bit out on a limb.

23 MR. ARMINSKI: Will you --

24 MR. ROSENBERG: I'll write them up, they're
25 not big issues.

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

1 MR. BEDARD: Is anyone from BLM supposed
2 to be represented for these scoping meetings?

3 MR. LOWENFELS: Beth Walton from BLM.

4 MR. BEDARD: It amazes me, you know, that
5 they've opened up that four million acre Denali planning block
6 for the kind of purposes that they did, knowing the significance
7 of wildlife and fisheries and archeological and other things in
8 that area. That really surprises me. And it's a shame they're
9 not here to hear some of the problems, because they may still
10 be alter some of that land.

11 MR. LATKA: Is Rico (ph) the BLM guy or is
12 it Kastron? The BLM rep, would that be Rico or would that be
13 Kastron?

14 MR. ARMINSKI: Well, Kastron is really the
15 one that we deal with most.

16 MR. LATKA: I think he's on vacation right
17 now. I mean, he hasn't come to anything anyway, but he's on vaca-
18 tion now.

19 MR. ARMINSKI: Are we off the record?

20 REPORTER: Not yet.

21 (OFF RECORD)

22 END OF PROCEEDINGS

23 * * * * *

24

25

GEMINI

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
277-8591

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

I, Teresa E. Mielke, Notary Public in and for the State of Alaska, residing at Anchorage, Alaska, and Electronic Reporter for Gemini Reporting Services, do hereby certify:

That this transcript as heretofore annexed is a true and correct transcript of said proceedings, taken by me electronically and thereafter transcribed by me.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and af-
fixed my seal this 6th day of April, 1985.

SEAL

Reporting Services
943 West 6th, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska-99501
277-8591