

3 0455 0002 3777 6

ANCHORAGE/FAIRBANKS
INTERTIE TRANSMISSION
LIBRARY

SUSITNA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
PROJECT No. 7114



ANCHORAGE/FAIRBANKS INTERTIE TRANSMISSION LINE WORKER SURVEY: FALL 1983

TK
1425
.S8
F472
no.1858

ORTH & ASSOCIATES, INC.

CONTRACT TO

ZA-EBASCO

JOINT VENTURE

FINAL REPORT

JULY 1984

DOCUMENT No. 1858

ALASKA POWER AUTHORITY

DEC 31 1984
ALASKA RESOURCES LIBRARY
U.S. DEPT. OF INTERIOR



Document No. 1858
Susitna File No. 4.5.2.1

TK
1425
.58
F472
no. 185

SUSITNA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

ANCHORAGE/FAIRBANKS INTERTIE TRANSMISSION LINE WORKER SURVEY: FALL 1983

Report by
Frank Orth & Associates, Inc.

Under Contract to
Harza-Ebasco Susitna Joint Venture

Prepared for
Alaska Power Authority

Final Report
July 1984

ARLIS
Alaska Resources
Library & Information Services
Anchorage, Alaska

NOTICE

**ANY QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS CONCERNING
THIS REPORT SHOULD BE DIRECTED TO
THE ALASKA POWER AUTHORITY
SUSITNA PROJECT OFFICE**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
LIST OF EXHIBITS	ii
1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
2.0 APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY	2
2.1 BACKGROUND	2
2.2 OBJECTIVES	2
2.3 METHODOLOGY AND RESPONSE RATE	3
3.0 KEY FINDINGS	5
3.1 PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS	5
3.2 LOCAL AND ALASKA EMPLOYMENT	5
3.3 WOMEN IN THE WORK FORCE	6
3.4 UNION STATUS OF WORK FORCE	6
3.5 WORKER IN-MIGRATION	7
3.6 DEPENDENTS ACCOMPANYING NON-LOCAL WORKERS	8
3.7 HOUSING	10
3.8 PLANS TO REMAIN IN COMMUNITY	10
3.9 COMPARISON TO SUSITNA MODEL ASSUMPTIONS	11
4.0 DETAILED RESULTS	14

LIST OF EXHIBITS

<u>EXHIBIT</u>		<u>PAGE</u>
1	COMPARISON OF SELECTED SURVEY RESULTS WITH ASSUMPTIONS USED IN THE SUSITNA SOCIOECONOMIC IMPACT MODEL	14
2	INTERTIE WORKERS BY OCCUPATION	15
3	JOB BY MAJOR JOB TITLE	16
4	IS YOUR JOB A UNION JOB?	17
5	WHERE IS YOUR WORK WEEK RESIDENCE?	18
6	WHAT TYPE OF HOUSING DO YOU LIVE IN?	19
7	WHERE DO YOU LIVE ON THE WEEKEND OR ON YOUR TIME OFF?	20
8	PRIOR LOCATION OF RESIDENCE	21
9	RESIDENCE STATUS	22
10	PRIOR LOCATION OF RESIDENCE OF MOVERS	23
11	WHERE WAS YOUR DEPENDENTS PRIOR RESIDENCE?	24
12	WHERE IS YOUR DEPENDENTS PRESENT RESIDENCE?	25
13	HOW MANY DEPENDENTS DO YOU HAVE?	26
14	NUMBER OF DEPENDENTS ACCOMPANYING MOVERS	27
15	GROUPED AGE OF LOCAL AND NON-LOCAL DEPENDENTS	28
16	GROUPED AGE OF LOCAL AND NON-LOCAL RESPONDENTS	29
17	GROUPED AGE OF LOCAL AND NON-LOCAL WORKER'S HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS	30
18	GROUPED AGE OF NON-LOCAL DEPENDENTS THAT ARE PRESENT IN THE COMMUNITIES DURING THE WEEK	31
19	GROUPED AGE OF NON-LOCAL WORKERS	32
20	GROUPED AGE OF NON-LOCAL WORKER'S HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS	33
21	GROUPED AGE OF MOVERS (WORKERS AND DEPENDENTS)	34
22	NUMBER OF EMPLOYED DEPENDENTS PRESENT AMONG NON-LOCAL WORKERS WITH DEPENDENTS PRESENT	35
23	INTENT TO REMAIN AFTER PROJECT COMPLETION - ALL WORKERS	36
24	INTENT TO REMAIN AFTER PROJECT COMPLETION - NON-LOCAL WORKERS	37
25	SEX OF RESPONDENTS	38
26	DO YOU HAVE DEPENDENTS? BY TYPE OF RESIDENT	39
27	WORKERS WITH DEPENDENTS: ARE THEY PRESENT?	40
28	ALL WORKERS - UNION STATUS BY PRIOR LOCATION	41

LIST OF EXHIBITS
(CONT.)

<u>EXHIBIT</u>		<u>PAGE</u>
29	CANTWELL WORKERS - UNION STATUS BY PRIOR LOCATION	42
30	TALKEETNA WORKERS - UNION STATUS BY PRIOR LOCATION	43
31	CANTWELL WORKERS - UNION STATUS BY OCCUPATION	44
32	TALKEETNA WORKERS - UNION STATUS BY OCCUPATION	45
33	ALL WORKERS - UNION STATUS BY OCCUPATION	46

1.0 INTRODUCTION

A survey of workers employed in the construction of the Alaska Power Authority's Intertie Transmission Line (Intertie) was conducted in October 1983. The survey was conducted to support the needs of the Social Science Program of the Susitna Hydroelectric Project.

The purpose of the survey was to provide information on the characteristics of people working on transmission line construction in the area of the proposed Susitna Hydroelectric Project's proposed transmission line. Workers were asked questions about their prior and present residence; number, residence and employment status of dependents; housing; union status; and post-project plans.

This survey was conducted early in the construction process; site clearing and construction on this project began in 1983. At the time of the survey, brushcutters and foundation workers comprised the largest components of the Intertie work force. Field personnel associated with the construction management and engineering portions of the project were also surveyed. An additional survey will be conducted in 1984 during later stages of project construction.

Information gained from this and the subsequent Intertie worker survey will be used to refine the assumptions on work force characteristics and relocation patterns that are applied in the model used to project socioeconomic impacts of the Susitna Hydroelectric Project.

2.0 APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 BACKGROUND

The Alaska Power Authority is constructing a 170 mile, 345kV transmission line between Willow and Healy. The Intertie line will link the electric power distribution systems in Anchorage and Fairbanks.

There are two general contractors on the Intertie Project. The northern portion of the project is being constructed by Susitna Constructors, with project headquarters located in Cantwell. Irby-Northface Joint Venture is the contractor for the southern portion of the line, with project headquarters in Talkeetna.

The two contractors have used different work force management techniques. Susitna Constructors is using union labor and is providing housing for workers whereas Irby-Northface JV is using non-union labor and only provides housing for administrative/engineering employees.

Morrison-Knudsen is the Intertie construction manager; Commonwealth Associates is the design engineer.

2.2 OBJECTIVES

This survey effort was developed in order to obtain information that could be used to evaluate assumptions made in the Susitna Hydroelectric Project socioeconomic impact model. Two categories of information were sought:

1. Information on the characteristics of construction workers in Alaska.
2. Information on the effect of project management decisions (such as the use of union labor and the provision of housing) on the origin and relocation pattern of construction workers.

In addition, the project team adopted survey methods designed to be methodologically sound and feasible under field conditions. The questionnaire was designed so that it could be administered at various stages of the project.

2.3 METHODOLOGY AND RESPONSE RATE

Questionnaires were prepared on 5" by 8" cards that were distributed by the contractors to all workers on the Intertie Project in October 1983. A copy of the survey instrument is displayed in Figure 1.

Approximately 148 questionnaires were distributed, and 88 responses were received. The following tabulation presents the response rate, by community:

	<u>Number of Responses</u>	<u>Number Distributed</u>	<u>Percent Response Rate</u>
Cantwell	45	46	98%
Talkeetna	43	102	42%
Total	88	148	59%

FIGURE 1
CONSTRUCTION WORKER SURVEY INSTRUMENT

ALASKA POWER AUTHORITY ANCHORAGE/FAIRBANKS INTERTIE WORKER SURVEY

1. What do you do on the Intertie Project? _____
2. Is your job: union _____; non-union _____?
3. What town do you live in now during the week? _____
4. What type of housing do you live in now during the week? (Check one)
_____ housing provided by employer _____ travel trailer _____ apartment _____ tent
_____ lodge/hotel/motel _____ mobile home _____ house _____ other
5. What town do you usually live in on weekends and during other time off from work?
Town _____; State _____
6. What town did you live in before you took this job? Town _____; State _____
- IF YOU HAVE DEPENDENTS, PLEASE ANSWER QUESTION #7. IF YOU DO NOT, PLEASE SKIP TO QUESTION #8.
- 7a. What town did your dependents live in before you took this job?
Town _____; State _____
- 7b. What town do your dependents live in now? Town _____; State _____
- 7c. What are the ages of each of your dependents? _____
- 7d. How many of your dependents are currently employed? _____
8. Where do you plan to live after your job on this project is completed?
Town _____; State _____
9. What is your age? _____
10. Male _____; Female _____.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION.
(See reverse side of card for more information about this survey.)

3.0 KEY FINDINGS

3.1 PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS

1. Eighty-nine percent of the respondents were male, 11 percent were female.
2. The largest categories of workers were: construction trades, mostly involved in laying foundations (24%); brushcutters and treefellers (23%); managers (13%); quality assurance employees (10%); engineering and surveying personnel (8%); and clerical workers (8%).
3. Approximately 36 percent of the responding workers indicated they held union jobs.
4. The average age of the respondents was about 36 years old.

3.2 LOCAL AND ALASKA EMPLOYMENT

Overall, 77 percent of the workers in the survey were residents of Alaska ^{1/} prior to beginning work on the project. Thirty-three percent of the workers were from Anchorage and Fairbanks.

As shown below, the Talkeetna portion of the project hired a significantly larger percentage of local residents (residents of the community or nearby areas within daily commuting distance) but a lower percentage of Alaska residents than the Cantwell portion:

	<u>Talkeetna Portion</u>	<u>Cantwell Portion</u>
Local Hire	38%	7%
Alaska Hire	68%	85%

^{1/} For purposes of this report, the term "Alaska resident" refers to an individual who lived in Alaska prior to beginning work on the project.

The relatively low percentage of Alaska hire in Talkeetna may be related to the fact that a larger portion of the respondents in that community were administrative/engineering employees, and thus not subject to the Alaska hire requirements. The union status of the Cantwell portion of the project appears to be partially responsible for the relatively low local hire in that community.

In addition, it appeared that the use of union workers on the Cantwell portion of the project had a significant effect on the origin of the non-local work force. A large group of respondents from the Cantwell portion of the project were from Anchorage and Fairbanks (62%), large urban areas in which union hiring halls are located. In contrast, only 2 percent of the Talkeetna respondents were from Anchorage and none had lived in Fairbanks before they took the job on the Intertie Project.

Local workers received jobs of all kinds on the project. They were strongly represented in the clerical and machine trades categories. ^{1/} Local workers accounted for 63 percent and 50 percent of the total jobs in those categories, respectively.

3.3 WOMEN IN THE WORK FORCE

Ten of the 87 respondents that answered the question on gender were women. Eighty percent of the women in the survey worked in Talkeetna. Approximately 60 percent of the women held clerical positions; the remaining female respondents held the following types of positions: manager/foreman, laborer, quality assurance, and brushcutter.

3.4 UNION STATUS

Union status differed dramatically among the two groups. In Cantwell, over two-thirds of the workers held union jobs. In Talkeetna, none of the respondents had union jobs. Overall, union employees accounted for 36% of the survey respondents.

^{1/} Includes mechanics and operators of machinery and equipment.

Approximately 24 percent of the professional/technical/managerial employees of the project belonged to unions. Over 70 percent of the union workers had lived in Anchorage or Fairbanks prior to joining the project.

3.5 WORKER IN-MIGRATION

During the work week, all workers on the Intertie Project lived in or near Cantwell or Talkeetna, the communities serving as staging sites for the two contractors. Overall, the workers can be divided into two groups -- locals and non-locals -- depending upon their relationship to the local communities and labor force. Non-locals can be further delineated into movers and weekly commuters, as indicated below:

Locals - Individuals from the local work force who lived in or near Cantwell or Talkeetna prior to gaining employment on the Intertie Project. These workers did not change their place of residence due to their employment on the project and can also be considered non-movers.

Non-Locals - 1. Movers - Individuals from outside the local area who moved their weekend residence after obtaining this job. In most cases, these workers moved their weekend residence to Cantwell or Talkeetna. ^{1/}

2. Weekly Commuters - Individuals whose previous residence was within weekend commuting distance from the staging site. These workers lived in Talkeetna or Cantwell during the work week, but commuted to their previous residence during their time off.

Overall, 20.5 percent of the respondents (18 workers) were locals and 79.5 percent (70 workers) were non-locals. Of the non-locals, 47 percent (33 workers) were weekly commuters and 53 percent (37 workers) were movers.

^{1/} The mover category includes four workers (two in the Cantwell survey and two in the Talkeetna survey) who moved from a prior residence to live in Talkeetna or Cantwell during the week, and a third location (usually Anchorage) during their weekends/time off (thus moving both their work week and weekend residences).

The survey results differed sharply for the two communities. In Cantwell, weekly commuters represented the majority of the non-local work force (62 percent). In Talkeetna, most non-local workers were movers; weekly commuters represented only 25 percent of the non-local work force.

Using these data and the information on response rates in Section 2.3, the total in-migration into the communities (includes survey respondents and workers that did not respond) can be estimated. In Cantwell, approximately 16 workers were movers and an additional 27 workers commuted weekly to the community. In Talkeetna, if survey results are representative of the overall work force, approximately 50 workers were movers and an additional 17 workers commuted weekly to the community. It should be reiterated, however, that the relatively low response rate in Talkeetna makes generalizations from the survey results difficult to rely upon. This information is summarized below:

	<u>Cantwell</u>		<u>Talkeetna</u>	
	<u>Survey Number</u>	<u>Estimated Total</u>	<u>Survey Number</u>	<u>Estimated Total</u>
Movers Into Community	14	14	19	45
Movers Into Other Areas	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>5</u>
Subtotal of Movers	16	16	21	50
Weekly Commuters	<u>26</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>17</u>
Total Non-Local Workers	42	43	28	67

3.6 DEPENDENTS ACCOMPANYING NON-LOCAL WORKERS

As indicated above, 79.5 percent of the workers surveyed were non-locals (i.e. had not lived in the community prior to obtaining a job on the project). Questions about these workers' dependents yielded information on the population influx into the communities.

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent of Total Non- Local Workers</u>	<u>Percent of Total Respondents</u>
Non-local Workers	70	100.0%	79.5%
Non-local Workers W/ Dependents	42	60.0%	47.7%
Non-local Workers W/ Dependents Present	12	17.1%	13.6%

Dependents could include spouses, children, or other individuals that live with the worker or that are otherwise dependent on the worker for some amount of financial support.

As shown in the tabulation above, 60 percent of the in-migrant workers that were surveyed answered that they had dependents (53% in Cantwell, 72% in Talkeetna). However, only 12 of the 42 non-local workers working in Cantwell or Talkeetna, who had dependents, were accompanied by their dependents. Thus, 17 percent of all non-local workers were accompanied by dependents.

The survey showed an average of 0.39 dependents present in the communities per non-local worker, or 2.25 dependents per accompanied non-local worker. Approximately 16 school-age children accompanied the 12 non-local workers with dependents present. This equals an average of 1.3 school children per accompanied worker.

The following tabulation shows the population in-migration for each community, in terms of both the survey respondents and the estimated total work force:

	<u>Cantwell</u>		<u>Talkeetna</u>	
	<u>Survey Number</u>	<u>Estimated Total</u>	<u>Survey Number</u>	<u>Estimated Total</u>
Workers that Moved	16	16	21	50
Weekly Commuter Workers	26	27	7	17
Dependents	<u>13</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>33</u>
Total Population In-migration*	42	43	28	67
In-migrating Schoolchildren	9	9	7	17

* This definition of in-migration includes weekly commuters who are not present in the community all seven days per week.

Only two of the 27 non-local dependents that in-migrated into the local communities were employed. This results in approximately 0.17 employed dependent per accompanied non-local worker.

3.7 HOUSING

Although there is some ambiguity in the information concerning types of housing reported by survey respondents, the data show clear differences in the patterns of housing utilization by the workers in the two portions of the project. These differences appear to result from differences in housing policies by the two contractors. In Cantwell, at least 58 percent of the work force lived in housing provided by the employer; in addition, another 33 percent of the workers lived in single family homes, mobile homes and lodging that may have also been provided by the contractor. In contrast, only 12 percent of the Talkeetna work force responded that they lived in employer-provided housing; an additional 19 percent living in mobile homes may have had their housing provided by the employer as well. The majority (52%) lived in single-family units.

As would be expected, the majority of project workers that were accompanied by their families resided in single family units and mobile homes (76%).

3.8 PLANS TO REMAIN IN COMMUNITY

Thirteen percent of the non-local workers who responded to this question indicated that they planned to remain in the community they were working in upon completion of the project. An additional 14 percent indicated that they were uncertain where they would live after the project is completed. Fifteen of the 19 non-local workers who were considering remaining in the communities were in the Talkeetna portion of the project.

It is interesting to note that intention to remain in the communities of Talkeetna and Cantwell was higher among weekly commuters than among movers. However, the reverse is true if those uncertain about remaining are included in the calculation:

	<u>Plan To Stay</u>	<u>Uncertain</u>	<u>Do Not Plan To Stay</u>
Weekly Commuters (n=33)	18.2%	3.0%	78.9%
Movers (n=37)	8.1%	24.3%	67.6%
Total (n=70)	12.9%	14.2%	72.9%

The survey also showed that workers with dependents (whether present in the community or not) were more likely to plan to remain in the community than workers without dependents. However, this conclusion is based upon a relatively small sample, and thus should not be relied upon without further substantiation:

	<u>Plan To Stay</u>	<u>Do Not Plan To Stay</u>	<u>Uncertain</u>
Workers w/ Dependents (n=42)	16.6%	66.7%	16.6%
Workers w/o Dependents (n=28)	7.1%	82.1%	10.7%
Total (n=70)	12.9%	72.9%	14.2%

3.9 COMPARISON TO SUSITNA MODEL ASSUMPTIONS

Exhibit 1 contains a comparison of data from the Intertie survey with assumptions used in the Susitna socioeconomic impact model that were related to construction worker characteristics.

3.9.1 Method of Comparison

Because of the complexity of the Susitna model projections, two aspects related to these figures should be noted. First, the model assumptions presented in Exhibit 1 are from the December 1983 update of the car transportation scenario, since these data are the most current and also represent the transportation scenario presented in the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission License Application. Second, where an assumption varies over time, the 1990 figure is used.

3.9.2 Results of Comparison

As Exhibit 1 shows, the Susitna model assumptions are very close to the data collected on worker origin from the Intertie work force in Cantwell, but differ substantially from data on the Talkeetna portion, and, therefore, the total Intertie work force.

The work force origin figures from the Cantwell survey are practically identical to the assumptions used in the Susitna model. For instance, the Susitna model assumes that 6 percent of the work force will be locals

(residents of the Local Impact Area), and that approximately 86 percent of the Susitna work force will be Alaskan residents, with 81 percent coming from the Railbelt. Correspondingly, the Cantwell portion of the Intertie survey showed 7 percent of the respondents to be locals and 85 percent to be Alaska residents, with 80 percent from the Railbelt.

The Susitna model assumes that approximately 33 percent of the non-local work force would be movers. This is similar to data obtained in the Cantwell portion of the Intertie survey, in which 38 percent of the non-local work force were movers. For the Susitna Project, however, we recognize that employer-provided housing will not be sited in the communities (except for Railhead workers) and that this may affect the comparison made above.

The close relationship between the Susitna model assumptions and the Cantwell Intertie work force may be related to the fact that the Susitna model assumed a unionized work force, and thus was directly comparable to the Cantwell portion of the Intertie.

There are several possible reasons for the difference between the Susitna model projections and the Talkeetna portion of the Intertie work force. First, the Talkeetna portion of the project did not have any union positions, and thus the origin of the work force was different. In addition, the Talkeetna work force had a higher percentage of respondents that were administrative/engineering employees than the work force in Cantwell or the work force assumed for the Susitna project. Finally, the low response rate in Talkeetna causes some uncertainty as to whether the survey results in Talkeetna are representative of the overall work force.

In the cases of two types of assumptions, the data on the Intertie work force differs substantially from the assumptions in the Susitna model. First, the Susitna model assumes that 90 percent of the workers who relocate their permanent residence in nearby communities will be accompanied by dependents, whereas in the Intertie survey, only 27 percent of the relocating respondents brought dependents to the community. However, it should be remembered that most unaccompanied workers on the Susitna Project are expected to reside at the work camp.

Second, the Susitna model assumes that approximately 74 percent of the workers that in-migrate will remain in the Local Impact Area. The Intertie work force survey indicates that only about 20 percent are expected to remain. A significant difference in the Susitna projections and the Intertie work force was expected, in these types of characteristics, because of the differences in the length of the project construction periods.

The two-year construction period of the Intertie Project would be expected to cause different relocating behavior by workers than will occur on the Susitna project, which will be built over a seventeen-year period. However, such a large variance was not expected, and the Susitna assumptions will be reevaluated in light of information from this and the subsequent Intertie survey.

4.0 DETAILED RESULTS

EXHIBIT 1
COMPARISON OF SELECTED SURVEY RESULTS WITH ASSUMPTIONS
USED IN THE SUSITNA SOCIOECONOMIC IMPACT MODEL

	<u>Susitna Model Assumptions</u> <u>1/</u>	<u>Intertie Survey Data</u>		
		<u>Cantwell</u>	<u>Talkeetna</u>	<u>Total</u>
Percent Locals	6%	7%	38%	20%
Percent Alaska Residents	86%	85%	68%	77%
Origin of Work Force				
Railbelt	81%	80%	56%	68%
Other Alaska	5%	4%	14%	9%
Out-of State	14%	16%	30%	23%
Percent of Non-Local Workers That Are Movers	33%	38%	75%	53%
Percent of Movers that are Accompanied by Dependents	90%	31%	24%	27%
Number of Dependents Per Accompanied Worker	2.51	2.17	2.33	2.25
Number of Schoolchildren Per Accompanied Worker	1.003	1.5	1.2	1.3
Percent of Movers that Plan to Remain in Community	74%	--	--	20% <u>2/</u>

1/ From the Susitna Hydroelectric Project Socioeconomic Impact model (December 1983 Update, Car Transportation Scenario).

2/ In the Intertie survey, respondents answered that they were planning to stay, not planning to stay, or uncertain. For purposes of this table, it was assumed that approximately 50 percent of those answering "uncertain" would remain.

EXHIBIT 2
INTERTIE WORKERS BY OCCUPATION

CANTWELL

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
PROFESSIONAL, TECHNICAL, MANAGERS	15	33.3%
CLERICAL, SALES	04	8.9%
AGRICULTURE, FISHERY, FORESTRY	12	26.7%
MACHINE TRADES <u>1/</u>	02	4.4%
STRUCTURAL	11	24.4%
MINING	01	2.2%
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	45	99.9%

TALKEETNA

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
PROFESSIONAL, TECHNICAL, MANAGERS	14	33.3%
CLERICAL, SALES	04	9.5%
AGRICULTURE, FISHERY, FORESTRY	08	19.0%
MACHINE TRADES <u>1/</u>	06	14.3%
STRUCTURAL	05	11.9%
PACKAGING AND MATERIALS HANDLING	01	2.4%
MINING	03	7.1%
MISCELLANEOUS	01	2.4%
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	42	99.9%
NON RESPONSE	01	

TOTAL

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
PROFESSIONAL, TECHNICAL, MANAGERS	29	33.3%
CLERICAL, SALES	08	9.2%
AGRICULTURE, FISHERY, FORESTRY	20	23.0%
MACHINE TRADES <u>1/</u>	08	9.2%
STRUCTURAL	16	18.4%
PACKAGING AND MATERIALS HANDLING	01	1.1%
MINING	04	4.6%
MISCELLANEOUS	01	1.1%
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	87	99.9%
NON RESPONSE	01	

1/ Includes mechanics and operators of machinery and equipment.

EXHIBIT 3
JOB BY MAJOR JOB TITLE

CANTWELL

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
ENGINEER, SURVEYOR OR STAKER	04	8.9%
TECHNICAL (QUALITY ASSURANCE)	05	11.1%
CLERICAL & SECRETARIES	03	6.7%
MANAGERS & FOREMAN	04	8.9%
BRUSHCUTTERS & TREEFELLERS	12	26.7%
CONSTRUCTION TRADES	12	26.7%
MECHANICS	02	4.4%
PILOTS	03	6.7%
	----	----
	45	100.1%

TALKEETNA

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
ENGINEER, SURVEYOR OR STAKER	03	7.1%
TECHNICAL (QUALITY ASSURANCE)	04	9.5%
CLERICAL & SECRETARIES	04	9.5%
MANAGERS & FOREMAN	07	16.7%
BRUSHCUTTERS & TREEFELLERS	08	19.0%
CONSTRUCTION TRADES	09	21.4%
MECHANICS	04	9.5%
LABORER	02	4.8%
PILOTS	01	2.4%
	----	----
	42	99.9%
NON RESPONSE	01	

TOTAL

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
ENGINEER, SURVEYOR OR STAKER	07	8.0%
TECHNICAL (QUALITY ASSURANCE)	09	10.3%
CLERICAL & SECRETARIES	07	8.0%
MANAGERS & FOREMAN	11	12.6%
BRUSHCUTTERS & TREEFELLERS	20	23.0%
CONSTRUCTION TRADES	21	24.1%
MECHANICS	06	6.9%
LABORER	02	2.3%
PILOTS	04	4.6%
	----	----
	87	99.8%
NON RESPONSE	01	

EXHIBIT 4
IS YOUR JOB A UNION JOB?

CANTWELL

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
YES	32	71.1%
NO	13	28.9%
	-----	-----
	45	100.0%

TALKEETNA

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
NO	43	100.0%
	-----	-----
	43	100.0%

TOTAL

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
YES	32	36.4%
NO	56	63.6%
	-----	-----
	88	100.0%

EXHIBIT 5
WHERE IS YOUR WORK WEEK RESIDENCE? 1/

CANTWELL

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
CANTWELL	45	100.0%
	---	----
	45	100.0%

TALKEETNA

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
TALKEETNA	40	93.0%
TRAPPER CREEK	1	2.3%
WILLOW	1	2.3%
MONTANA CREEK	1	2.3%
	---	----
	43	99.9%

TOTAL

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
TALKEETNA	40	45.5%
CANTWELL	45	51.1%
TRAPPER CREEK	1	1.1%
WILLOW	1	1.1%
MONTANA CREEK	1	1.1%
	---	----
	88	99.9%

1/ Three workers indicated that they live in Anchorage or Fairbanks during the week. For purposes of this tabulation, it was assumed that these workers misunderstood the question and they were coded as residing during the week in the community in which they worked.

EXHIBIT 6
WHAT TYPE OF HOUSING DO YOU LIVE IN?

CANTWELL

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING UNIT	09	20.0%
MOBILE HOME	03	6.7%
HOUSING PROVIDED BY EMPLOYER <u>1/</u>	26	57.8%
LODGE/HOTEL/MOTEL	03	6.7%
TRAVEL TRAILER	04	8.9%
	<u>45</u>	<u>100.1%</u>

TALKEETNA

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING UNIT	22	52.4%
APARTMENT	04	9.5%
MOBILE HOME	08	19.0%
HOUSING PROVIDED BY EMPLOYER <u>1/</u>	05	11.9%
LODGE/HOTEL/MOTEL	02	4.8%
TRAVEL TRAILER	01	2.4%
	<u>42</u>	<u>100.0%</u>
NON RESPONSE	01	

TOTAL

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING UNIT	31	35.6%
APARTMENT	04	4.6%
MOBILE HOME	11	12.6%
HOUSING PROVIDED BY EMPLOYER <u>1/</u>	31	35.6%
LODGE/HOTEL/MOTEL	05	5.7%
TRAVEL TRAILER	05	5.7%
	<u>87</u>	<u>99.8%</u>
NON RESPONSE	01	

1/ Because employer-provided housing could include other types of housing (for example, mobile homes, lodge/hotel/motel), these categories are not mutually exclusive and the results are somewhat ambiguous.

EXHIBIT 7
WHERE DO YOU LIVE ON THE WEEKEND OR ON YOUR TIME OFF?

CANTWELL

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
CANTWELL	15	34.1%
OTHER MAT-SU	04	9.1%
ANCHORAGE	09	20.5%
FAIRBANKS	11	25.0%
OTHER RAILBELT	02	4.5%
OUT-OF-STATE	03	6.8%
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	44	100.0%
NON RESPONSE	01	

TALKEETNA

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
TALKEETNA	34	79.1%
TRAPPER CREEK	01	2.3%
OTHER MAT-SU	05	11.6%
ANCHORAGE	03	7.0%
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	43	100.0%

TOTAL

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
TALKEETNA	34	39.1%
CANTWELL	15	17.2%
TRAPPER CREEK	01	1.1%
OTHER MAT-SU	09	10.3%
ANCHORAGE	12	13.8%
FAIRBANKS	11	12.6%
OTHER RAILBELT	02	2.3%
OUT-OF-STATE	03	3.4%
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	87	99.8%
NON RESPONSE	01	

EXHIBIT 8
PRIOR LOCATION OR RESIDENCE

CANTWELL

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
CANTWELL	03	6.7%
OTHER MAT-SU	03	6.7%
ANCHORAGE	16	35.6%
FAIRBANKS	12	26.7%
OTHER RAILBELT	02	4.4%
OTHER ALASKA OUTSIDE RAILBELT	02	4.4%
OUT-OF-STATE	07	15.6%
	-----	-----
	45	100.1%

TALKEETNA

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
TALKEETNA	15	34.9%
TRAPPER CREEK	01	2.3%
OTHER MAT-SU	07	16.3%
ANCHORAGE	01	2.3%
OTHER ALASKA OUTSIDE RAILBELT	06	14.0%
OUT-OF-STATE	13	30.2%
	-----	-----
	43	100.0%

TOTAL

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
TALKEETNA	15	17.0%
CANTWELL	03	3.4%
TRAPPER CREEK	01	1.1%
OTHER MAT-SU	10	11.4%
ANCHORAGE	17	19.3%
FAIRBANKS	12	13.6%
OTHER RAILBELT	02	2.3%
OTHER ALASKA OUTSIDE RAILBELT	08	9.1%
OUT-OF-STATE	20	22.7%
	-----	-----
	88	99.9%

EXHIBIT 9
RESIDENCE STATUS

CANTWELL

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
NON-MOVER	03	6.7%
MOVER	16	35.6%
WEEKLY COMMUTER	26	57.8%
	---	---
	45	100.1%

TALKEETNA

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
NON-MOVER	15	34.9%
MOVER	21	48.8%
WEEKLY COMMUTER	07	16.3%
	---	---
	43	100.0%

TOTAL

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
NON-MOVER	18	20.5%
MOVER	37	42.0%
WEEKLY COMMUTER	33	37.5%
	---	---
	88	100.0%

EXHIBIT 10
PRIOR LOCATION OR RESIDENCE OF MOVERS

CANTWELL

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
ANCHORAGE	08	50.0%
FAIRBANKS	01	6.3%
OTHER ALASKA OUTSIDE RAILBELT	02	12.5%
OUT-OF-STATE	05	31.3%
	-----	-----
	16	100.1%

TALKEETNA

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
OTHER MAT-SU	02	9.5%
OTHER ALASKA OUTSIDE RAILBELT	06	28.6%
OUT-OF-STATE	13	61.9%
	-----	-----
	21	100.0%

TOTAL

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
OTHER MAT-SU	02	5.4%
ANCHORAGE	08	21.6%
FAIRBANKS	01	2.7%
OTHER ALASKA OUTSIDE RAILBELT	08	21.6%
OUT-OF-STATE	20	48.6%
	-----	-----
	88	99.9%

EXHIBIT 11
WHERE WAS YOUR DEPENDENTS PRIOR RESIDENCE?

CANTWELL

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
CANTWELL	01	4.3%
OTHER MAT-SU	02	8.7%
ANCHORAGE	08	34.8%
FAIRBANKS	06	26.1%
OTHER RAILBELT	01	4.3%
OTHER ALASKA OUTSIDE RAILBELT	01	4.3%
OUT-OF-STATE	04	17.4%
	-----	-----
	23	99.9%

TALKEETNA

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
TALKEETNA	10	33.3%
TRAPPER CREEK	01	3.3%
OTHER MAT-SU	03	10.0%
FAIRBANKS	01	3.3%
OTHER ALASKA OUTSIDE RAILBELT	01	3.3%
OUT-OF-STATE	14	46.7%
	-----	-----
	30	99.9%

TOTAL

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
TALKEETNA	10	18.9%
CANTWELL	01	1.9%
TRAPPER CREEK	01	1.9%
OTHER MAT-SU	05	9.4%
ANCHORAGE	08	15.1%
FAIRBANKS	07	13.2%
OTHER RAILBELT	01	01.9%
OTHER ALASKA OUTSIDE RAILBELT	02	3.8%
OUT-OF-STATE	18	33.9%
	-----	-----
	53	100.0%

EXHIBIT 12
WHERE IS YOUR DEPENDENTS PRESENT RESIDENCE?

CANTWELL

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
CANTWELL	07	30.4%
OTHER MAT-SU	02	8.7%
ANCHORAGE	06	26.1%
FAIRBANKS	05	21.7%
OUT-OF-STATE	03	13.0%
	-----	-----
	23	99.9%

TALKEETNA

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
TALKEETNA	15	50.0%
TRAPPER CREEK	01	3.3%
OTHER MAT-SU	03	10.0%
FAIRBANKS	01	3.3%
OTHER ALASKA OUTSIDE RAILBELT	01	3.3%
OUT-OF-STATE	09	30.0%
	-----	-----
	30	99.9%

TOTAL

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
TALKEETNA	15	28.3%
CANTWELL	07	13.2%
TRAPPER CREEK	01	1.9%
OTHER MAT-SU	05	9.4%
ANCHORAGE	06	11.3%
FAIRBANKS	06	11.3%
OTHER ALASKA OUTSIDE RAILBELT	01	1.9%
OUT-OF-STATE	12	22.6%
	-----	-----
	53	99.9%

ALASKA RESOURCES LIBRARY
U.S. DEPT. OF INTERIOR

EXHIBIT 13
HOW MANY DEPENDENTS DO YOU HAVE?

CANTWELL

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
0	22	48.9%
1	05	11.1%
2	09	20.0%
3	09	20.0%
<hr/>		
ALL WORKERS	45	100.0%
WORKERS WITH DEPENDENTS	23	
TOTAL DEPENDENTS	50	
AVG DEPENDENTS PER WORKER W/ DEPENDENT	2.2	
STANDARD DEVIATION	0.8	
AVERAGE DEPENDENTS PER WORKER	1.1	

TALKEETNA

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
0	13	30.2%
1	07	16.3%
2	07	16.3%
3	08	18.6%
4	03	07.0%
5	05	11.6%
<hr/>		
ALL WORKERS	43	100.0%
WORKERS WITH DEPENDENTS	30	
TOTAL DEPENDENTS	82	
AVG DEPENDENTS PER WORKER W/ DEPENDENT	2.7	
STANDARD DEVIATION	1.4	
AVERAGE DEPENDENTS PER WORKER	1.9	

TOTAL

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
0	35	39.8%
1	12	13.6%
2	16	18.2%
3	17	19.3%
4	03	3.4%
5	05	5.7%
<hr/>		
ALL WORKERS	88	100.0%
WORKERS WITH DEPENDENTS	53	
TOTAL DEPENDENTS	132	
AVG DEPENDENTS PER WORKER W/ DEPENDENT	2.5	
STANDARD DEVIATION	1.2	
AVERAGE DEPENDENTS PER WORKER	1.5	

EXHIBIT 14
NUMBER OF DEPENDENTS ACCOMPANYING MOVERS

CANTWELL

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
1	01	20.0%
3	04	80.0%
	---	-----
ACCOMPANIED MOVERS	05	100.0%
NUMBER OF DEPENDENTS	13	
AVG DEPENDENTS PER WORKER W/ DEPENDENT	2.6	
STANDARD DEVIATION	0.9	
AVERAGE DEPENDENTS PER WORKER	0.3	

TALKEETNA

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
1	02	40.0%
2	01	20.0%
3	01	20.0%
4	01	20.0%
	---	-----
ACCOMPANIED MOVERS	05	100.0%
NUMBER OF DEPENDENTS	11	
AVG DEPENDENTS PER WORKER W/ DEPENDENT	2.2	
STANDARD DEVIATION	1.3	
AVERAGE DEPENDENTS PER WORKER	0.3	

TOTAL

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
1	03	30.0%
2	01	10.0%
3	05	50.0%
4	01	10.0%
	---	-----
ACCOMPANIED MOVERS	10	100.0%
NUMBER OF DEPENDENTS	24	
AVG DEPENDENTS PER WORKER W/ DEPENDENT	2.4	
STANDARD DEVIATION	1.1	
AVERAGE DEPENDENTS PER WORKER	0.5	

EXHIBIT 15
GROUPED AGE OF LOCAL AND NON-LOCAL DEPENDENTS

CANTWELL

<u>AGE</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>
00 - 04	06
05 - 13	19
14 - 17	10
18 - 19	01
20 - 29	03
30 - 39	05
40 - 49	03
50 - 64	00
65 +	00
TOTAL	47
MEAN	15.7
STANDARD DEVIATION	12.4

TALKEETNA

<u>AGE</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>
00 - 04	14
05 - 13	29
14 - 17	19
18 - 19	02
20 - 29	06
30 - 39	08
40 - 49	02
50 - 64	01
65 +	00
TOTAL	81
MEAN	14.5
STANDARD DEVIATION	11.6

TOTAL

<u>AGE</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>
00 - 04	20
05 - 13	48
14 - 17	29
18 - 19	03
20 - 29	09
30 - 39	13
40 - 49	05
50 - 64	01
65 +	00
TOTAL	128
MEAN	14.9
STANDARD DEVIATION	11.9

EXHIBIT 16
GROUPED AGE OF LOCAL AND NON-LOCAL RESPONDENTS

CANTWELL

<u>AGE</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>
18 - 19	03
20 - 29	10
30 - 39	16
40 - 49	11
50 - 64	05
65 +	00
TOTAL	45
MEAN	35.8
STANDARD DEVIATION	10.4

TALKEETNA

<u>AGE</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>
18 - 19	01
20 - 29	09
30 - 39	22
40 - 49	04
50 - 64	06
65 +	00
TOTAL	42
MEAN	35.7
STANDARD DEVIATION	11.6

TOTAL

<u>AGE</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>
18 - 19	04
20 - 29	19
30 - 39	38
40 - 49	15
50 - 64	11
65 +	00
TOTAL	87
MEAN	35.8
STANDARD DEVIATION	11.0

EXHIBIT 17
GROUPED AGE OF LOCAL AND NON-LOCAL
WORKER'S HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS 1/

<u>AGE</u>	<u>CANTWELL</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>
00 - 04		06
05 - 13		19
14 - 17		10
18 - 19		04
20 - 29		13
30 - 39		21
40 - 49		14
50 - 64		05
65 +		<u>00</u>
TOTAL		92
MEAN		25.5
STANDARD DEVIATION		15.7
MEDIAN AGE OF ALL RESIDENTS		24.0

<u>AGE</u>	<u>TALKEETNA</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>
00 - 04		14
05 - 13		29
14 - 17		19
18 - 19		03
20 - 29		15
30 - 39		30
40 - 49		06
50 - 64		07
65 +		<u>00</u>
TOTAL		123
MEAN		21.7
STANDARD DEVIATION		15.2
MEDIAN AGE OF ALL RESIDENTS		19.0

<u>AGE</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>
00 - 04		20
05 - 13		48
14 - 17		29
18 - 19		07
20 - 29		28
30 - 39		51
40 - 49		20
50 - 64		12
65 +		<u>00</u>
TOTAL		215
MEAN		23.4
STANDARD DEVIATION		15.5
MEDIAN AGE OF ALL RESIDENTS		21.0

1/ Includes all Intertie workers and all dependents.

EXHIBIT 18
GROUPED AGE OF NON-LOCAL DEPENDENTS THAT ARE
PRESENT IN THE COMMUNITIES DURING THE WEEK

CANTWELL

<u>AGE</u>	<u>NUMBER OF DEPENDENTS</u>
00 - 04	01
05 - 13	07
14 - 17	02
18 - 19	00
20 - 29	01
30 - 39	02
40 - 49	00
	--
TOTAL	13
MEAN	14.6
STANDARD DEVIATION	11.1

TALKEETNA

<u>AGE</u>	<u>NUMBER OF DEPENDENTS</u>
00 - 04	03
05 - 13	05
14 - 17	02
18 - 19	00
20 - 29	00
30 - 39	03
40 - 49	01
	--
TOTAL	14
MEAN	16.4
STANDARD DEVIATION	13.1

TOTAL

<u>AGE</u>	<u>NUMBER OF DEPENDENTS</u>
00 - 04	04
05 - 13	12
14 - 17	04
18 - 19	00
20 - 29	01
30 - 39	05
40 - 49	01
	--
TOTAL	27
MEAN	15.5
STANDARD DEVIATION	12.0

EXHIBIT 19
GROUPED AGE OF NON-LOCAL WORKERS

CANTWELL

<u>AGE</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>
18 - 19	02
20 - 29	10
30 - 39	15
40 - 49	10
50 - 64	05
65 +	00
TOTAL	42
MEAN	36.2
STANDARD DEVIATION	10.4

TALKEETNA

<u>AGE</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>
18 - 19	01
20 - 29	05
30 - 39	13
40 - 49	04
50 - 64	05
65 +	00
TOTAL	28
MEAN	37.5
STANDARD DEVIATION	11.2

TOTAL

<u>AGE</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>
18 - 19	03
20 - 29	15
30 - 39	28
40 - 49	14
50 - 64	10
65 +	00
TOTAL	70
MEAN	36.7
STANDARD DEVIATION	10.6

EXHIBIT 20
GROUPED AGE OF NON-LOCAL
WORKER'S HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS 1/

CANTWELL

<u>AGE</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>
00 - 04	06
05 - 13	18
14 - 17	09
18 - 19	03
20 - 29	13
30 - 39	20
40 - 49	13
50 - 64	05
65 +	<u>00</u>
TOTAL	87
MEAN	25.6
STANDARD DEVIATION	15.9

TALKEETNA

<u>AGE</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>
00 - 04	07
05 - 13	20
14 - 17	14
18 - 19	02
20 - 29	06
30 - 39	20
40 - 49	06
50 - 64	06
65 +	<u>00</u>
TOTAL	81
MEAN	23.4
STANDARD DEVIATION	16.0

TOTAL

<u>AGE</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>
00 - 04	13
05 - 13	38
14 - 17	23
18 - 19	05
20 - 29	19
30 - 39	40
40 - 49	19
50 - 64	11
65 +	<u>00</u>
TOTAL	168
MEAN	24.5
STANDARD DEVIATION	15.9

1/ Includes non-local Intertie workers and their dependents.

EXHIBIT 21
GROUPED AGE OF MOVERS
(WORKERS AND DEPENDENTS)

CANTWELL

<u>AGE</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>
00 - 04	02
05 - 13	11
14 - 17	03
18 - 19	00
20 - 29	05
30 - 39	11
40 - 49	05
50 - 64	01
65 +	00
TOTAL	<u>38</u>
MEAN	24.7
STANDARD DEVIATION	15.3

TALKEETNA

<u>AGE</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>
00 - 04	06
05 - 13	13
14 - 17	10
18 - 19	02
20 - 29	06
30 - 39	14
40 - 49	04
50 - 64	05
65 +	00
TOTAL	<u>60</u>
MEAN	23.5
STANDARD DEVIATION	16.3

TOTAL

<u>AGE</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>
00 - 04	08
05 - 13	24
14 - 17	13
18 - 19	02
20 - 29	11
30 - 39	25
40 - 49	09
50 - 64	06
65 +	00
TOTAL	<u>98</u>
MEAN	23.9
STANDARD DEVIATION	15.8

EXHIBIT 22
NUMBER OF EMPLOYED DEPENDENTS PRESENT AMONG
NON-LOCAL WORKERS WITH DEPENDENTS PRESENT

<u>NUMBER OF DEPENDENTS</u>	<u>CANTWELL</u>		<u>TALKEETNA</u>		<u>TOTAL</u>	
	<u>NUMBER WORKERS</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>	<u>NUMBER WORKERS</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>	<u>NUMBER WORKERS</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
0	05	83.3%	05	83.3%	10	83.3%
1	01	16.7%	01	16.7%	02	16.7%
	--	-----	--	-----	--	-----
	06	100.0%	06	100.0%	12	100.0%
NON-LOCAL DEPENDENTS THAT WORK	01		01		02	
AVERAGE EMPLOYED DEPENDENTS PER WORKER	0.17		0.17		0.17	

EXHIBIT 23
INTENT TO REMAIN AFTER PROJECT COMPLETION 1/
ALL WORKERS

CANTWELL

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
YES	06	13.3%
NO	36	80.0%
UNCERTAIN	03	6.7%
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	45	100.0%

TALKEETNA

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
YES	20	47.6%
NO	15	35.7%
UNCERTAIN	07	16.7%
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	42	100.0%
NON RESPONSE	01	

TOTAL

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
YES	26	29.9%
NO	51	58.6%
UNCERTAIN	10	11.5%
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	87	100.0%
NON RESPONSE	01	

1/ Refers to whether respondent Intertie workers plan to remain in their work week residences.

EXHIBIT 24
INTENT TO REMAIN AFTER PROJECT COMPLETION 1/
NON-LOCAL WORKERS (IN PERCENT)

<u>CATEGORY OF WORKER</u>		<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>UNCERTAIN</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
MOVER WITH DEPENDENTS PRESENT <u>2/</u>	(n=10)	10.0%	50.0%	40.0%	100.0%
MOVER W/OUT DEPENDENTS PRESENT <u>2/</u>	(n=14)	14.3%	71.4%	14.3%	100.0%
MOVER W/OUT DEPENDENTS	(n=13)	0.0%	76.9%	23.1%	100.0%
TOTAL MOVERS	(n=37)	8.1%	67.6%	24.3%	100.0%
COMMUTERS WITH DEPENDENTS PRESENT <u>2/</u>	(n= 2)	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
COMMUTERS W/OUT DEPENDENTS PRESENT <u>2/</u>	(n=16)	25.0%	68.8%	6.3%	100.0%
COMMUTERS W/OUT DEPENDENTS	(n=15)	13.3%	86.7%	0.0%	100.0%
TOTAL COMMUTERS	(n=33)	18.2%	78.8%	3.0%	100.0%
TOTAL NON-LOCAL WORKERS	(n=70)	12.9%	72.9%	14.2%	100.0%

n = Number of respondents in each category of worker.

1/ Refers to whether respondent Intertie workers (non-local) plan to remain in their work week residences after project completion.

2/ Refers to presence of dependents in community where worker resides during the week.

EXHIBIT 25
SEX OF RESPONDENTS

CANTWELL

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
MALE	43	95.6%
FEMALE	02	4.4%
	---	---
	45	100.0%

TALKEETNA

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
MALE	34	81.0%
FEMALE	08	19.0%
	---	---
	42	100.0%

NON RESPONSE	01	
--------------	----	--

TOTAL

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
MALE	77	88.5%
FEMALE	10	11.5%
	---	---
	87	100.0%

NON RESPONSE	01	
--------------	----	--

EXHIBIT 26
DO YOU HAVE DEPENDENTS?
BY TYPE OF RESIDENT

CANTWELL

	<u>MOVERS</u>		<u>NON-MOVERS</u>		<u>WEEKLY COMMUTERS</u>	
	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
YES	09	56.3%	01	33.3%	13	50.0%
NO	07	43.8%	02	66.7%	13	50.0%
	—	—	—	—	—	—
	16	100.1%	03	100.0%	26	100.0%

TALKEETNA

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
YES	15	71.4%	10	66.7%	05	71.4%
NO	06	28.6%	05	33.3%	02	28.6%
	—	—	—	—	—	—
	21	100.0%	15	100.0%	07	100.0%

TOTAL

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
YES	24	64.9%	11	61.1%	18	54.5%
NO	13	35.1%	07	38.9%	15	45.5%
	—	—	—	—	—	—
	37	100.0%	18	100.0%	33	100.0%

EXHIBIT 27
WORKERS WITH DEPENDENTS, ARE THEY PRESENT?
BY TYPE OF RESIDENT

CANTWELL

	<u>MOVERS</u>		<u>NON-MOVERS</u>		<u>WEEKLY COMMUTERS</u>	
	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
YES	05	55.6%	01	100.0%	01	7.7%
NO	04	44.4%	00	0.0%	12	92.3%
	—	—	—	—	—	—
	09	100.0%	01	100.0%	13	100.0%

TALKEETNA

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
YES	05	33.3%	09	90.0%	01	20.0%
NO	10	66.7%	01	10.0%	04	80.0%
	—	—	—	—	—	—
	15	100.0%	10	100.0%	05	100.0%

TOTAL

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
YES	10	41.7%	10	90.9%	02	11.1%
NO	14	58.3%	01	09.1%	16	88.9%
	—	—	—	—	—	—
	24	100.0%	11	100.0%	18	100.0%

EXHIBIT 28
ALL WORKERS
UNION STATUS BY PRIOR LOCATION OF RESIDENCE 1/

<u>PRIOR LOCATION</u>	<u>UNION</u>	<u>UNION STATUS</u> <u>NON-UNION</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
TALKEETNA	00	15	15
CANTWELL	01	02	03
TRAPPER CREEK	00	01	01
OTHER MAT-SU	02	08	10
ANCHORAGE	14	03	17
FAIRBANKS	09	03	12
OTHER RAILBELT	02	00	02
OTHER ALASKA OUTSIDE RAILBELT	01	07	08
OUT-OF-STATE	03	17	20
	—	—	—
TOTAL	32	56	88

1/ No Intertie workers in Talkeetna held union jobs.

EXHIBIT 29
CANTWELL WORKERS
UNION STATUS BY PRIOR LOCATION OF RESIDENCE

<u>PRIOR LOCATION</u>	<u>UNION</u>	<u>UNION STATUS</u> <u>NON-UNION</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
TALKEETNA	00	00	00
CANTWELL	01	02	03
TRAPPER CREEK	00	00	00
OTHER MAT-SU	02	01	03
ANCHORAGE	14	02	16
FAIRBANKS	09	03	12
OTHER RAILBELT	02	00	02
OTHER ALASKA OUTSIDE RAILBELT	01	01	02
OUT-OF-STATE	03	04	07
	—	—	—
TOTAL	32	13	45

EXHIBIT 30
TALKEETNA WORKERS
UNION STATUS BY PRIOR LOCATION OF RESIDENCE 1/

	<u>UNION STATUS</u>	
	<u>NON-UNION</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
TALKEETNA	15	34.9%
TRAPPER CREEK	01	2.3%
OTHER MAT-SU	07	16.3%
ANCHORAGE	01	2.3%
OTHER ALASKA OUTSIDE RAILBELT	06	14.0%
OUT-OF-STATE	13	30.2%
	<u>43</u>	<u>100.0%</u>

1/ No Intertie workers in Talkeetna held union jobs.

EXHIBIT 31
CANTWELL WORKERS
UNION STATUS BY OCCUPATION

<u>OCCUPATION</u>	<u>UNION</u>	<u>UNION STATUS</u> <u>NON-UNION</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
PROFESSIONAL, TECHNICAL, MANAGERS	07	08	15
CLERICAL, SALES	00	04	04
SERVICE WORKERS	00	00	00
AGRICULTURE, FISHERY, FORESTRY	12	00	12
PROCESSING	00	00	00
MACHINE TRADES	01	01	02
BENCHWORK	00	00	00
STRUCTURAL	11	00	11
ARMED FORCES	00	00	00
RECREATION-BASED	00	00	00
MOTOR FREIGHT & TRANSPORTATION	00	00	00
PACKAGING AND MATERIALS HANDLING	00	00	00
MINING	01	00	01
MISCELLANEOUS	00	00	00
	--	--	--
TOTAL	32	13	45

EXHIBIT 32
TALKEETNA WORKERS
UNION STATUS BY OCCUPATION 1/

	UNION STATUS	PERCENT
	NON-UNION	
PROFESSIONAL, TECHNICAL, MANAGERS	14	33.3%
CLERICAL, SALES	04	9.5%
AGRICULTURE, FISHERY, FORESTRY	08	19.0%
MACHINE TRADES	06	14.3%
STRUCTURAL	05	11.9%
PACKAGING AND MATERIALS HANDLING	01	2.4%
MINING	03	7.1%
MISCELLANEOUS	01	2.4%
	---	---
	42	99.9%

1/ No Intertie workers in Talkeetna held union jobs.

EXHIBIT 33
ALL WORKERS
UNION STATUS BY OCCUPATION 1/

<u>OCCUPATION</u>	<u>UNION</u>	<u>UNION STATUS</u>		<u>TOTAL</u>
		<u>NON-UNION</u>		
PROFESSIONAL, TECHNICAL, MANAGERS	07	22		29
CLERICAL, SALES	00	08		08
SERVICE WORKERS	00	00		00
AGRICULTURE, FISHERY, FORESTRY	12	08		20
PROCESSING	00	00		00
MACHINE TRADES	01	07		08
BENCHWORK	00	00		00
STRUCTURAL	11	05		16
ARMED FORCES	00	00		00
RECREATION-BASED	00	00		00
MOTOR FREIGHT & TRANSPORTATION	00	00		00
PACKAGING AND MATERIALS HANDLING	00	01		01
MINING	01	03		04
MISCELLANEOUS	00	01		01
	--	--		--
TOTAL	32	55		87

1/ No Intertie workers in Talkeetna held union jobs.