# TONGASS NATIONAL FOREST PLAN AMENDMENT
# OBJECTION RESOLUTION MEETING

VOLUME I

Cape Fox Hotel
Shaa Hit Conference Room
Ketchikan, Alaska
October 12, 2016

BEFORE:

REVIEWING OFFICER BETH PENDLETON;
REGIONAL FORESTER ALASKA
EARL STEWART, TONGASS FOREST SUPERVISOR
FACILITATOR: JAN CAULFIELD

Page 2

P R O C E E D I N G S
(Ketchikan, Alaska - 10/12/2016)
(On record)
MS. CAULFIELD: Good morning, everyone. We're going to go ahead and get started. I want to welcome you and thank you for coming to this meeting here in Ketchikan and also those that are participating on the phone. As you know, we're gathered together to talk about the Tongass National Forest Plan Amendment and participate in this meeting that's related to objection resolution.
My name is Jan Caulfield. I think I had a chance to say hello to most of you before the meeting started this morning. I live in Juneau. I am in a private business doing meeting facilitation services and largely related to natural resource issues, so I really appreciate the opportunity to be here and hopefully be helpful to you all during this process this week and next.
I wanted to just take a minute to make sure that everybody has a copy of the agenda. We, of course, here in Ketchikan have the agenda on the sign-in table so you should have been able to pick that up there. It's also on the website for the Tongass Forest Plan Amendment objections process, so you can find that

Page 3

there.
We'll spend more time in a moment going through the agenda. It is lengthy because it covers all six days of the meetings and we wanted to sort of lay it all out as best we could for you. So I'll take more time on that for a minute, but right now I just really wanted to call your attention to the meeting outcomes. What we're planning to work with you on and this will be reiterated, I know, by Beth in her opening remarks.
But just to call your attention to those on Page 1 and there's just two. The first is the intent is that people attending the meeting, those of us here, will understand the Tongass National Forest Plan Amendment objection review process and its status, how the information that's discussed at the meeting this week and next week in Juneau will inform the final decision on the Forest Plan Amendment and next steps. So just to understand that process and we will definitely spend time on that.
Substantively, the second outcome there is for the issues or topics that are identified in the agenda for consideration at this meeting we want to make sure that those that are identified by the Forest Service as objectors and interested persons have an

Page 4

opportunity to discuss and clarify their objections with Beth, who is the Reviewing Officer for this meeting, and suggest ideas and opportunities for resolution. So that is really the key to the meeting and I know Beth will be going over that more.
So really this is an opportunity for real constructive dialogue and we're trying to structure the meeting to make sure that we emphasize plenty of time for those discussions and dialogue. So looking forward to that. Again, I'll go over the rest of the agenda and the order of the issues and the process a bit later.
So just a little bit on housekeeping. If you wouldn't mind muting your cell phones if you're here in the room just so it doesn't go off and embarrass you in some way later. We've all had that happen to us I know. I'm hoping mine's off. Yeah. If you're on the phone, and of course this is very important and I'd appreciate it, I think everybody has done this so far, please mute your personal phone that you're connected to the teleconference with so we're not hearing background noise. It sounds great right now and we really appreciate that.
So there will be times, of course, when those who are on the phone who are objectors or

Page 5

interested persons will be speaking, introducing yourself here in a moment, and during the times that you're participating in the discussion, we'll ask you to take it off mute then, of course, but for the most part keep it on mute.
We are recording the meeting. Tina is here to help with the recording and will be transcribing, so the idea, the intent there is to have a very complete record that the Forest Service will have to work from. But that does involve cooperation on all of our parts, which is why when we're speaking we all need to use our microphones and it's a pretty simple on/off system. You've got a button there. But there may be times that I'll say, oh, please turn on the mic so that we make sure that it's picking up recording equipment. It's doing two duties. One is to help here in the room and on the phone and the other is to make sure it's getting recorded properly.
It also is very helpful to Tina and to the record if you introduce yourself when you speak. You know, I think we'll just need to get in that habit. When you come in on a discussion, say, okay, you know, this is Chris now and I just want to add to that and say blah, blah, blah. Just so that we have the ability to make a very clear record of the meeting.



Computer Matrix, LLC Phone: 907-243-0668
135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501 Fax: 907-243-1473 Email: sahile@gci.net

Page 6

Again, as I said earlier -- well, let me do one more housekeeping thing. I think the exits are pretty self-explanatory. We have lots of ways to exit the room if there's a safety issue, so take a look at those. The restrooms are just down the hall past the sort of lobby area and check-in area, so for your convenience there. There's coffee, tea and water here in the room.

So, as I said, it's our intent really to have constructive dialogue with the Reviewing Officer, which is Beth Pendleton, about important issues related to the Forest Plan Amendment. My role as a facilitation is just to try to be helpful in whatever way to make sure that can happen in a real constructive manner. I've worked with lots of you before and I appreciate that I've had that opportunity and looking forward to it here again today.

As far as sort of ground rules for the process, just the basic things. We're asking that you respect and work with the process that we've laid out. We've tried to do something that we think will work well. It's not that it can't possibly be adjusted, but we want to try to make this process work in the time that we have.

Respect the time limits when speaking

Page 7

so that everybody has an equal opportunity to participate. Respectful communication amongst each other and with people from the Forest Service who are here and I think we all understand that these are really important issues that sometimes we feel passionate about and it's also important to be able to communicate clearly and respectfully about things. So that's what we'll be all asked to do.

Also, just in general, refrain from side conversations. If there's something that you need to talk about with somebody to check in, you know, we can step out of the room. If we're at a point where you really feel like, wow, we need to take a break so several of us can talk about something together and then come back and participate more fully, we can do that. We can fit those kinds of things in. So it's a matter of just letting us know as we get into some of the more substantive discussions.

So as I said, I think we're going to just go a little bit into introductions so you can see who's sitting where and then I'll turn it over to Beth soon for her opening, but we thought we'd do the introductions first. As I said, in the room and on the phone we've got people that are identified for the purposes of this process as objectors and interested

Page 8

persons and those are the people or entities, the parties that will be actively participating in discussions on the issues.

As I mentioned earlier, the meetings are open to the public. Some of you are here and joined us and we appreciate that, but it is listen only unless you're listed in the agenda as an objector and interested person. So thank you to those who are on the phone or here in the room joining us for taking the time to attend and to listen.

I think with that, Beth, I'm going to go ahead and just have you and Earl introduce yourselves and then I'll sort of help those of us who are here in the room and those on the phone who are objectors and interested persons. Just sort of sort out who is sitting where and we'll be about ready to roll.

MS. PENDLETON: Good morning, folks. It's good to have you all here. I know that this is a bit of a sacrifice for many of you to spend time, but I'm looking forward to the engagement.

My name is Beth Pendleton. I'm the Regional Forester for the Alaska Region. I've been in that position now almost seven years. I have worked on the Tongass and in the region most of my last 20 years

Page 9

with the Forest Service.

MR. STEWART: Good morning, everyone. My name is Earl Stewart. I'm the Forest Supervisor for the Tongass National Forest. I've been in this position about a year and a half now. I want to offer also my appreciation for each of you taking time away from your day today to be here with us and to offer the opportunity to talk to the Reviewing Official, the Regional Forester, Beth Pendleton.

My role in this is as the responsible official for the Forest Plan Amendment. I also want to express my sincere appreciation for the time that you allowed over the last few weeks for some of the ongoing informal kind of dialogue associated with this process.

So thank you.

MS. CAULFIELD: Okay. Thanks Beth and Earl. So what I'd like to do is, Owen, maybe just start with you and we'll go around the table, those of you who are here in the room. It's a good way to practice using your microphones. And then I'll come to the people who are on the phone. If you'd just like to say good morning and introduce yourself, that would be great for each of you to do.

MR. GRAHAM: Good morning. I'm Owen Graham. I'm the Executive Director of the Alaska



Computer Matrix, LLC Phone: 907-243-0668
135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501 Fax: 907-243-1473 Email: sahile@gci.net

Page 10

Forest Association.
MR. FRENCH: I'm Chris French, Director of Planning and Community Development for the Ketchikan Gateway Borough. Good morning.
MR. LINDEKUGEL: Buck Lindekugel, grassroots attorney for the Southeast Alaska Conservation Council.
MR. GALLEGOS: I'm Tony Gallegos. I'm the Cultural Resource Director with the Ketchikan Indian Community.
MS. HARRIS: Good morning. My name is Holly Harris. I'm a staff attorney with Earthjustice.
MR. EDWARDS: I'm Larry Edwards. I'm on the staff of Greenpeace. I'm also on the board of the Greater Southeast Alaska Conservation Community, GSACC. I'm representing the GSACC at all -- objection at the meeting here. We had five groups on that.
MR. GRIMM: Good morning. I'm Robert Grimm. I'm the CEO of Alaska Power and Telephone.
MR. KLEINHENZ: Good morning. My name is Brian Kleinhenz. I work for Sealaska Corporation. I'm going to represent Sealaska today.
MR. SLENKAMP: Good morning. I'm Paul Slenkamp. I'm with the Alaska Mental Health Trust, Land Office.

Page 11

MR. MAISCH: Good morning. My name is Chris Maisch. I'm the State Forester and Director of the Division of Forestry and the lead for the State Tongass Team for the objection process.
MS. CAULFIELD: Okay. Thank you. Now turning to people who are on the phone. Frank, would you like to go ahead and say good morning and I'll come to each of those of you who I know are on the phone and then we'll do a final sweep and see if any others have joined us. So, Frank.
MR. BERGSTROM: This is Frank Bergstrom. I'm an independent consultant in the mining business and I'm representing the Alaska Miners Association as well as First Things First Foundation.
MS. CAULFIELD: Thanks, Frank. Appreciate it. And Susan.
MS. CULLINEY: I'm Susan Culliney. I'm here representing I'm here representing Audubon Alaska. Good morning, everyone.
MS. CAULFIELD: Thanks very much, Susan. And Jim. Jim Clark.
(No response)
MS. CAULFIELD: Jim, we're not hearing you now. I know we spoke earlier and that you were on the phone. So he may be joining us at another time.

Page 12

What I'd like to do just as a final sweep just to make sure we know if anyone else has joined us. So I'm going to go through the list of objectors and interested persons and just see if anyone representing those parties are on the phone. So is there anyone on the phone representing the Alaska Wilderness League?
(No response)
MS. CAULFIELD: Okay. How about Alcan Forest Products.
(No response)
MS. CAULFIELD: Cascadia Wildlands.
(No response)
MS. CAULFIELD: Center for Biological Diversity.
(No response)
MS. CAULFIELD: City of Wrangell.
(No response)
MS. CAULFIELD: Defenders of Wildlife.
(No response)
MS. CAULFIELD: GEOS Institute.
(No response)
MS. CAULFIELD: Larry, you mentioned Greenpeace, so you're here for them as well. Thanks. Eric Lee.

Page 13

(No response)
MS. CAULFIELD: Hyak Mining.
MR. MACKINNON: I'm here. Neil MacKinnon.
MS. CAULFIELD: Hi, Neil. Great. Thank you very much. I feel like I just caught a fish. I got one. Okay. Ketchikan Chamber of Commerce. Anyone on the phone from the Ketchikan Chamber of Commerce.
(No response)
MS. CAULFIELD: Natural Resources Defense Council.
(No response)
MS. CAULFIELD: Resource Development Council.
(No response)
MS. CAULFIELD: Southeast Conference.
(No response)
MS. CAULFIELD: Sierra Club.
(No response)
MS. CAULFIELD: The Sitka Conservation Society.
(No response)
MS. CAULFIELD: The Boat Company.
(No response)



Computer Matrix, LLC Phone: 907-243-0668
135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501 Fax: 907-243-1473 Email: sahile@gci.net

Page 14

MS. CAULFIELD: We're almost done. Trout Unlimited.
(No response)
MS. CAULFIELD: Margo Waring.
(No response)
MS. CAULFIELD: George Woodbury.
(No response)
MS. CAULFIELD: And then just three more that are interested persons. Denise Boggs.
(No response)
MS. CAULFIELD: Actually two more. Ara Marderosian.
(No response)
MS. CAULFIELD: Okay. Thank you very much. I appreciate your being willing to take the time, but we needed to hear. Holly, yeah.
MS. HARRIS: Jan, do you need me to list off all the groups that I represent for the record?
MS. CAULFIELD: You know what, I'll just come get that from you. We won't need to do it now. But, yes, we'll make sure that we get that covered, Holly. Thanks.
MS. HARRIS: Okay. Thank you.
MS. CAULFIELD: Okay. So, with that,

Page 15

and thanks for participating in the opening, Beth, let's go ahead and I'll turn it to you. Thanks.
MS. PENDLETON: Well, again, good morning. Again, my appreciation for each of you being here, some of you for the next several days. As you know, these discussions are going to take place for the next three days and then we'll wrap up in Juneau Monday through Wednesday of next week.
(Music playing)
MS. PENDLETON: And so it begins.
(Laughter)
MS. CAULFIELD: I need to remind people who are on the phone to please mute your phones so that we don't have other sounds coming through the meeting room. Thank you very much. What could that be?
MR. GRAHAM: Someone's got you on hold. They can't hear you. I recognize the ring. I know who it is.
(Laughter)
MS. CAULFIELD: Owen, can you text them. For now I'm turning that phone down. It's not completely off, but we'll turn it down. Go ahead, Beth.
MS. PENDLETON: Great. Thank you for a little bit of humor. I think that's going to be

Page 16

important for the next few days. So I just wanted to talk a little bit about my role as the Reviewing Officer. I think all of you know that in 2012 the Agency promulgated our new Planning Rule. This is the first time I think here in Alaska, at least to this degree, that we have gone through the objection process. We've had a few other projects that we have moved forward on that with, but this is really the first time.
So I think we have some opportunity to really -- in the next six days really take some time to have dialogue and for me as the Reviewing Officer I oversee this process and it's important as well to ensure a timely review of all of the objections and really to consider and seek resolution before a final decision is made on the Plan Amendment.
As I noted, I've worked in Alaska most of the last 20 years and I recognize that many of the issues that have been raised through the objection process represent a full spectrum and that for many of the issues there are folks that feel very strongly on one side or the other of the issue. I think in our discussions we'll hear that. We'll hear different perspectives.
My interest as the Reviewing Officer is

Page 17

to seek clarity and better understand the objectors' issues, their concerns, and also to ask questions to deepen that understanding as well as to seek potential possible remedy for some of the issues that you bring forward.
I'm hoping that over the next six days that we can also collectively identify potential solutions to resolve issues that you've brought forward in your objections. This is an opportunity as well, in addition to the objectors, for interested persons and the Agency to work together on solutions.
I'm also very mindful, as I know you are, that a final plan and FEIS have been issued as well as a draft decision. So as part of this process I am also really focusing and reflecting on that Draft Record of Decision and whether or not what's contained in there is the right decision and as importantly if the FEIS, the Final Environmental Impact Statement, analysis contained therein supports that decision.
So questions that I will be asking will, one, seek an understanding of the issues that you're bringing forward. Two, to ensure that the draft decision is well supported by the FEIS and also opportunities to seek resolution through our dialogue. So I'll be looking to you to bring forward potential



Computer Matrix, LLC Phone: 907-243-0668
135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501 Fax: 907-243-1473 Email: sahile@gci.net

Page 18

remedy as we move through the various issues.
It's also clear for me to let you know that this resolution meeting is not an opportunity for negotiation. The purpose is really to discuss and clarify issues and explore resolution options.
There will be no final decisions made at this meeting. However, it's important that you know that the discussions that we have will inform and contribute to my final written response to all of the objections.
So I will have a bit more to say on process, but I just think that those are really, in essence, the most important things and I think the greatest value that we will realize together over the next several days will be the quality of the dialogue and the opportunity to seek a clear understanding of concerns and evaluate opportunities for resolution.
Again, I am pleased that you have taken the time. I'm really looking forward to the discussions. I know that they will be rich over the next few days both here in Ketchikan and Juneau. So thank you for being here.
MS. CAULFIELD: Thanks, Beth. Appreciate that. We're going to move into a session where there's just a brief overview of the Forest Plan

Page 19

Amendment process. Before we do that I just want to have a chance for the other folks here in the room to introduce themselves. This process has been very well supported by the Alaska Region staff and, of course, the Forest staff. They don't have a microphone, so I'm just going to ask people to stand and introduce yourselves and then we'll conclude with Susan Howle, who will actually be giving a short presentation on the status of the Forest Plan Amendment and that process.
Chris.
MR. FRENCH: Good morning. My name is Chris French. I'm the director of Ecosystem Management Coordination in Washington office national headquarters staff. We oversee NEPA and land management for the Agency.
MS. DALE: Good morning. I'm Robin Dale. I'm the Group Leader for Administrative Reviews, Litigation and FOIA for the Alaska Region and I'm the Review Coordinator for the Tongass Objections.
MS. LISOWSKI: Good morning. I'm Maria Lisowski. I'm the Director of Ecosystem Planning and Budget for the Alaska Region. I work out of Juneau.
MS. CAULFIELD: Go ahead, Sue and then -- go ahead Katie and Dru and then we'll come back to Sue.

Page 20

MS. BENNING: Good morning. I'm Katie Benning. I work in the Regional Office in Juneau with Robin and Maria and my major responsibility is the record.
MS. FENSTER: Good morning. I'm Dru Fenster. I'm a Public Affairs Specialist in the Regional Office in Juneau and I'm here to be the timekeeper.
MS. CAULFIELD: Go ahead, Sue, and then I'm going to give you my spot if you'd like to come up here and use this mic.
MS. HOWLE: Good morning, everyone. I'm Susan Howle and I have been the Interdisciplinary Team Leader and Project Manager for the last two and a half years. So it's a pleasure to finally reach this stage of the project. What I'm going to do right now is just kind of give a little bit of an overview of the planning process that we've been through over the last couple years and just basically start out talking about some of the milestones that we've reached since July of 2014 to now.
So I just wanted to start out with our Notice of Intent went out actually in May. The reason I say July is because I started the job in July and actually the plan amendment actually started before I

Page 21

came on board here on the Tongass.
Some of the milestones we have were we published a Notice of Intent in the Federal Register on May 27th which was announcing our intent to do an EIS and a plan amendment developed under the 2012 Planning Rule. We had a scoping period from May 27th to June 26th in 2014.
Because there was going to be a lot of time between scoping and the release of the Draft EIS, we decided to have some open house meetings just as an opportunity to share with the public the direction we were going and what we had available to share at that time. So those meetings took place in Ketchikan, Juneau and Sitka back in January and February of 2015.
As you know, we released our Notice of Availability for our draft in November of 2015, November 20th and then we had a 90-day comment period with that. We also held open houses and subsistence hearings in numerous communities in Southeast Alaska between January and February of 2016.
Our Notice of Availability of the Final EIS and Draft ROD was published on July 1st and then the objection filing period began on July 2nd and we published our notices in the newspaper of record Ketchikan Daily News and the Juneau Empire. Here we



Computer Matrix, LLC Phone: 907-243-0668
135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501 Fax: 907-243-1473 Email: sahile@gci.net

Page 22

are now. We're having objection resolution meetings. So that just kind of takes you through some of the major milestones that we've hit through our planning process.

So I just want to talk a little bit about the context. I think most of you in the room are aware of the context of our Forest Plan Amendment. As you know, we had a five-year review of the Forest Plan in 2013 and received I think about 150,000 comments on that as well. So we used that as well as our Secretary's memo to sort of determine the scope of our Plan Amendment.

In September of 2013 the Forest Supervisor provided a determination document that stated the following: That conditions on the land and demands of the public require the Tongass to modify the 2008 Forest Plan. So you can read a little bit more about factors that led to the need for change and that's in chapter 1 of the Final EIS right before you see the purpose and need.

So I'm going to talk a little bit about the five-year review. It was completed in 2013. Concerns were consistently expressed regarding the impact of high fossil fuel prices, the adverse effect of high energy costs on economic diversification and

Page 23

sustainable economic development and increasing the impacts of climate change on the quality of life in Southeast Alaska.

Concerns were also expressed that the 2008 Plan's direction regarding the transportation and utility system, including our TUS overlay LUD, were overly complex, which was a little confusing and difficult to implement. So that's just sort of what came from the five-year review, which we carried forward into the scope of the Plan Amendment.

I mentioned the Secretary of Agriculture's memo. This was a July 2nd, 2013 memo. In it I kind of highlight a particular part of it that talks about the memo affirms the transition to a more ecologically, socially and economically sustainable forest management and that's a high priority for the USDA, the Forest Service and the Tongass.

The USDA's goal is to effectuate this transition over the next 10 to 15 years so that at the end of this period the vast majority of timber sold on the Tongass will be young-growth. The timeframe will conserve old-growth forests while allowing the forest industry time to adapt. To achieve this goal several steps must be taken as described in the actions of the memo.

Page 24

So those are kind of the two parts that set the scope for the Tongass Plan Amendment, the five-year review and the renewable energy component of that as well as the transition to young-growth from the Secretary's memo.

The Final EIS is a programmatic analysis prepared by the Forest Service that basically describes and analyzes changes to the 2008 Forest Plan to accomplish the transition to young-growth management as provided in the Secretary's memo.

The Final EIS also evaluates which lands will be suitable for timber production, especially young-growth timber stands, and any changes or additions to management direction needed to promote and speed the transition to young-growth management while maintaining a viable timber industry in Southeast Alaska. Finally, the Final EIS describes and analyzes changes related to renewable energy development. So the scope of the analysis is limited to these changes.

As you know, historically the Tongass Timber Program has focused on economical harvest of old-growth timber seeking to meet market demand as directed by the Tongass Timber Reform Act as well as to provide jobs and opportunities in Southeast Alaska. Our current plan actually plans for a transition to

Page 25

young-growth timber harvesting primarily in about 30 years. That reflects when the oldest young-growth stands reach what we call culmination of mean annual increment.

So usually CMAI occurs in stands on the Tongass about 80 to 110 years old, but because we need to transition in a sooner timeframe we have been given the legislation to do so, providing a little bit more flexibility on this culmination of mean annual increment.

Now there's tradeoffs to that. I call them transition tradeoffs. So the advantage of this transition is we would be conserving old-growth forests into the future, but the disadvantages would be that because we have to seek to meet demand we would have to harvest young-growth in some areas that our current plan doesn't allow for. In particular, the beach and estuary fringe, riparian management areas and then some of the natural LUDs, land use designations, such as the old-growth habitat LUD.

Some of our alternatives in the EIS they vary depending on which LUDs you could harvest in. So when you look at our current LUDs on the Tongass, I believe there's about 18, there were probably about eight of the non-development LUDs that, depending on



Computer Matrix, LLC Phone: 907-243-0668
135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501 Fax: 907-243-1473 Email: sahile@gci.net

Page 26

which alternative you were looking at, you could actually enter into. So that was the disadvantage of the transition.

Our Forest Plan actually has -- as I said, we use the 2012 Planning Rule to amend our Forest Plan and the 2012 Planning Rule actually has some new terms and some new meanings to those terms. A couple of those that I'm pretty sure we'll be talking about in these meetings one of those terms is call plan components. Basically that's direction.

In our current plan, our direction was primarily we'd talk about them in terms of standards and guidelines. Plan components include standards and guidelines, but also goals, objectives, desired conditions and suitability of lands. They all are integrated to work together as you do projects implementing the Forest Plan.

Another term that I know we'll be talking about is called management approaches and these are used to describe the principle strategies and program priorities responsible -- the responsible official intends to employ to carry out projects and activities developed under the plan. So those are just a couple of new terms and meanings that we have under the new Planning Rule.

Page 27

As a team leader for the last two-plus years, this project has been on a very accelerated timeline and to do that and to have complexities come up has not always been an easy thing to deal with. I just kind of wanted to highlight a few things that came up during this planning process.

When we began, the Roadless Rule was still -- the applicability of the Roadless Rule was still in question on the Tongass. The Ninth Circuit had not made a decision on that. So we actually had to plan for that because we weren't sure which way the decision would go. So you probably notice that we had a couple of alternatives. It was alternatives 2 and 3 that kind of looked at roadless in a little bit different way.

I believe alternative 3 we assumed that the Roadless Rule exemption would come back and then under alternative 2 we looked at potentially doing new rulemaking to allow us to make what we called roaded roadless areas, to take that out of an inventoried roadless area. So those were a couple of the options we looked at.

The other alternatives we assumed that the Roadless Rule would apply on the Tongass, including our current plan because at the time it did apply. So

Page 28

I just wanted to bring that up as a complexity that we were dealing with.

The Natural Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year '15, that was the legislation that was enacted that the Sealaska land conveyance was part of that. So there were about 70,000 acres of NFS land conveyed to Sealaska Native Corporation and an additional eight LUD II management areas. So we actually were moving forward at the time developing our affected environment sections. I think most of you know we have a lot of tables with numbers and acres, so we had to go back and adjust for that, so that took a little bit of time.

Another opportunity, I wouldn't call it a complexity, is we were working hand-in-hand with a Federal Advisory Committee, the Tongass Advisory Committee. They were chartered to come up with how to transition to young-growth management in this timeframe. So we basically worked with them. They were trying to come up with some recommendations for us to include in our planning effort and they actually were able to provide us with draft recommendations at the draft EIS stage and then they finalized their recommendations a little bit later on.

So that was a really unique thing that

Page 29

happened, taking a Federal Advisory Committee's recommendations and making them -- you know, developing them as an alternative to analyzing our EIS.

We had a few other things. Representing all the action alternatives in a proposed plan. That was a little difficult. I think you may have had an opportunity to look at Appendix F of our FEIS where we had to compare each of the alternative direction by alternative and that was a little bit difficult. So just a few things to mention that weren't that easy for us.

The scoping issues came out and actually we're going to be talking about most of those here. Scoping issues, the significant issues that were carried forward in the Final EIS were young-growth transition, renewable energy, inventoried roadless areas and wildlife habitat and the conservation strategy. So we developed alternatives to address those issues in different ways.

I'll also mention that for what we were looking at we needed to look at what timber demand was. So the Pacific Northwest Science Lab conducted a study to come up with what demand was for timber on the Tongass. The demand analysis supported the timber objectives that were included in the plan and then they



Computer Matrix, LLC Phone: 907-243-0668
135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501 Fax: 907-243-1473 Email: sahile@gci.net

Page 30

were modeled in the final EIS.

We looked at a range of alternatives, including those that both were carried forward in our EIS, but also some that we strongly considered that for reasons either they didn't meet the purpose and need or were outside the scope of the Plan Amendment, but the Forest Service did strongly consider many alternatives in our Environmental Impact Statement.

Some of the alternatives not studied in detail were to develop an amendment using the previous planning rule procedures. The Mental Health Trust Land Exchange, including that in all the action alternatives. The State of Alaska, we worked with the State on an alternative that actually we -- we actually modeled that alternative with all the alternatives to see as far as whether or not it would meet the purpose and need, which it did not.

We had a couple other alternatives looking at an immediate end to old-growth logging as well as transition to limited young-growth logging in five years. So these were just some of the alternatives that we did look at, but they didn't meet the purpose and need for our plan amendment.

We carried forward five alternatives that were analyzed in detail in the Final EIS. I won't

Page 31

get into all of them, but these are described in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS. Alternative 5 is our selected alternative in the Draft ROD. That is based on the Tongass Advisory Committee recommendations.

I think most of you are aware the Tongass Advisory Committee was made up of representatives from Federally recognized tribes, Alaska Native organizations, Native corporations, national and regional environmental conservation organizations, the timber industry operators, Federal State and local governments, permittees and other commercial operators and the general public.

I can remember thinking back to the first meeting that the TAC had and it was here in Ketchikan. As an ID team, interdisciplinary team leader, I remember telling the Tongass Advisory Committee that what they're going to be going through is very similar to what we go through on an interdisciplinary team because we have different specialists that represent different resources and it was a very similar process in a way.

So the selected alternatives. Again, I won't go into too much detail as far as how it compares with the other alternatives. This is all listed in Chapter 2 of the EIS.

Page 32

The Amended Forest Plan Direction was written in a new Chapter 5 in our plan and the title of that chapter is Plan Content Developed Under the 2012 Planning Rule. It includes plan content related to young-growth, renewable energy and transportation systems corridors. So young-growth and renewable energy, that obviously was part of the scope of the plan amendment. The new direction for transportation systems corridors was rewritten under 2012 Rule Planning Directives due to the removal of the transportation and utilities system LUD.

We also developed other Forest-wide direction that you kind of would see in Chapters 2 and 4, but because we developed it under the new Planning Rule we actually put it in Chapter 5.

So there are some new project consistency provisions. As I said, our current Plan was developed under the '82 Planning Rule and kind of focused primarily on standards and guidelines as the main direction. Now we have these integrated plan components under the 2012 Rule, so we have new project consistency provisions that basically say that if you're implementing a project using the Chapter 3 and 4 direction, you have to be consistent with the standards and guidelines, but if you're using -- say you're

Page 33

developing a renewable energy project or a young-growth project, the Chapter 5 plan components it's not just the standards and guidelines that apply, it's all plan components. You have to be consistent with all plan components. So any decision you have after we sign this ROD would have to show that in the decision document. So that's one new change under the new Planning Rule.

I think most of you saw in the Draft ROD that we had a section in there called transition to the 2016 Forest Plan Amendment. We just wanted to make it clearer. I think most of you remember under the 2008 Plan we actually kind of grandfathered in some projects; timber sales. So the new rule basically says that all activities under a plan developed under the 2012 Planning Rule, a final decision document, if you approve a decision, it has to be consistent with the new Planning Rule.

So basically, for activities or projects for which final decisions have been made, as long as we haven't signed our decision document, they can move forward under the previous plan, but as soon as we sign this decision on this Plan any future projects would have to be consistent with the new Plan.

So recap just of our public



Computer Matrix, LLC Phone: 907-243-0668
135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501 Fax: 907-243-1473 Email: sahile@gci.net

Page 34

participation. We did conduct scoping. We invited several cooperating agencies. The Fish and Wildlife Service was a cooperating agency on our Forest Plan Amendment. We continued to have government to government and government to corporation consultation. We held three public open house meetings, as I said, back in January and February of 2015. We also outreached to youth. We had a Youth Advisory Council from the Ketchikan High School that was involved in our planning effort.

We held DEIS public open house meetings in nine Southeast Alaska communities as well as subsistence hearings in January and February of 2016. We've been keeping our website updated, our Forest Plan Amendment website, with newsletters and our documents and our maps. Now we're in the objection process, the final part where the public is involved.

I did want to mention that we had over 150,000 comments on our Draft EIS and I think there were a little over 1,000 unique comments that we addressed. You will find those in Appendix I of the FEIS. That's where we had to respond to comments. Attachment A in that appendix also provides copies of letters that we received from government agencies, elected officials and tribal governments.

Page 35

Just thinking about the Draft EIS public comments, again some of the more substantive comments that were brought up have to do with things we're going to be discussing for the next few days here and in Juneau.

Some of those things were application of the Planning Rule, our purpose and need, range of alternatives, the transition timeframe, young-growth inventory, market demand, Tongass conservation strategy, climate change and carbon storage, protection of the Nature Conservancy/Audubon priority conservation areas and Tongass 77 watersheds, public costs and removal of the transportation utility system LUD.

Objections were filed within 60 days of the date of the legal notice and the filing period closed on August 30th. I believe we'll be hearing a little bit more about how we're handling objections.

So that's all I have for now. Any questions or comments. It's been a very lengthy timeframe, but on a very fast trajectory. So I'm glad to be here today and the next week or two.

MR. STEWART: This is Earl. I would be remiss if I didn't acknowledge your leadership along with all the effort and energy over the last several years that the ID team has put forth. From the Forest

Page 36

Supervisor's standpoint, I offer my sincere appreciation for your efforts and your energy.

Thank you.

MS. HOWLE: Thanks, Earl.

MS. CAULFIELD: Thank you, Sue. Appreciate that. This is Jan Caulfield again. We're going to just enter into our last session of the morning. As you see, we sort of structured the morning as things that we needed to get done to get organized and get moving and then we'll come back at 1:00 o'clock and start tackling issues. That first issue this afternoon will be renewable energy. We really felt it was important -- and we'll be doing this in Juneau too just to lay the groundwork and make sure everybody understands how the process works.

We're going to ask Beth to give some more information about the objection process and the resolution meeting and then we'll close the session with some sort of nuts and bolts from me about how we'll start working together this afternoon.

So Beth.

MS. PENDLETON: Thank you, Jan. Thank you too to Sue for that overview. I think it's really important to kind of set the stage over the last couple of years relative to the amendment process. So I want

Page 37

to take a few minutes and talk a little bit more about the objection process and our time that we spend over the next few days together, give a little bit of an overview of the process, talk a little bit about the range of issues that have been submitted and that we'll be discussing, talk a little bit about the issues selected for objection resolution and then most importantly how these discussions relate to the final decision yet to be produced on the Forest Plan Amendment.

So let me begin with the overview of the objection process and as described by Sue Howle in the overview of the Plan Amendment process. This Amendment was prepared under the 2012 Planning Rule, which includes a pre-decisional administrative review process, also known as the Objections Process. So this is a new process that we are going through.

Under the Objections Process, individuals and entities who submitted substantive formal comment during the planning process may file objections after the Environmental Analysis is completed and before a final decision is signed.

The Objections Process builds on the early participation and collaborative efforts that have occurred throughout the planning process with the

Page 38

intent of trying to resolve the lingering concerns of those individuals and interested persons that have been participating in the planning process. It's an opportunity as well for an independent review and resolution of issues before a final decision is made on the Plan Amendment.

As I stated earlier, as the objection Reviewing Officer, it's my responsibility to oversee this process, ensure timely review of all of the objections and consider and seek resolution of the objection issues.

During our discussion in this resolution meeting I expect to ask questions that are going to help me to understand the concerns that you're bringing forward and to explore opportunities there may be to address those concerns.

The responsible official for the Tongass Plan Amendment is Earl Stewart, the Forest Supervisor. Earl will be participating in the next several days in these discussions to help answer any questions that might arise. These discussions are open to the public for observation, but public comment will not be taken. The resolution meeting is intended to result in an exchange of ideas among the Reviewing Officer, yourselves as objectors and interested person,

Page 39

to seek resolution to issues raised in the objections.

So as may have been mentioned, there were 27 eligible objections received and all of the objections were posted to the Tongass website so that objectors, interested persons and the public can review those, review the content and help understand the issues that have been raised.

Several individuals or entities requested what's called an interested person status. Interested persons have also participated in the planning process and have a particular interest in the resolution of an objection issue. Those with interested persons status also have an opportunity to participate in these discussions.

The eligible objections that were raised cover many different issues and they're quite broad in the concerns that were raised, but there's also a considerable overlap among many of the objections that were brought forward.

I believe that we all know that there are very different perspectives on how the Tongass should be managed, so it's not a surprise that there are objections on both sides of nearly every issue and I expect those differing perspectives will be well represented in our discussions this week.

Page 40

My encouragement I think to the objectors and our interested persons with myself and Earl is to work together to offer solutions to resolve issues. So this is a meeting for us to work together and to come forward with suggestions to solutions to the issues that have been raised.

During the planning process the public identified its significant issues as Sue mentioned and these included young-growth transition, renewable energy, inventoried roadless areas and wildlife habitat and the conservation strategy. So I've considered how the issues raised in the objections relate to these significant issues when identifying which issues to select for the focus of this resolution meeting.

I've included in our agenda for today, tomorrow and then next Monday and Tuesday in Juneau those issues that I found appropriate for discussion based on my need for clarification of the issue or for my consideration of potential resolution options. I'd like your feedback to determine if the issues can be resolved.

While there are likely many other aspects of these issues that could be discussed, I ask that the objectors and interested persons for each issue address your comments or concerns to the specific

Page 41

issue statements identified in the agenda, and that's in Attachment 1. So as we get into the meat of the issues I want to make sure that you take a look at Attachment 1 and specifically the issues that have been raised in that statement.

This is important as well. The opportunity to raise other issues that are not currently identified on the agenda is available and our facilitator will walk us through that. Jan is going to walk us through those instructions in a moment for identifying those issues for day three, so it will be this Friday here in Ketchikan, and then next Wednesday in Juneau on day six of the agenda.

Depending on the number of issues raised, I may not include all issues raised for the agenda on days three or six. As I've done for the issues currently included on the agenda, I'll review the issues raised based on my need for feedback, to clarify the issue and/or for my consideration of potential resolution options for these issues. Jan is going to go over the specifics for days three and six in just a few moments.

The last thing I want to just visit a little bit on is how these discussions, the discussions we have this week and next week, relate to the Final



Computer Matrix, LLC Phone: 907-243-0668
135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501 Fax: 907-243-1473 Email: sahile@gci.net

Page 42

Record of Decision on the Forest Plan Amendment. And Earl as the deciding official and the responsible official, he will be the one who will sign that Record of Decision.

I want to make clear that the resolution meeting again is not a negotiation. The purpose is to discuss and clarify issues, to seek agreement around facts and to explore resolution options. That's what we're here for this week.

I'll carefully consider all of our discussion and will review a written record of this meeting, which will be prepared by the court reporter, and the record will also be posted on the Tongass website shortly following the concluding of these meetings.

Again, no decision will be made at this meeting, but the discussions that we have here this week will inform and contribute to my final written response to all of the objections, which is required under the regulation within 90 days from the close of the objection submittal response date.

So hopefully that provides a little bit more clarification around why we're here this week and the process that we're going to be following. I'm going to turn it over to Jan, who is going to talk a

Page 43

little bit more about day three and day six. If there are issues that you currently don't see on the agenda that you'd like to bring forward for discussion on those days, she's going to run us through that process.

MS. CAULFIELD: So great. Thanks, Beth. Just, as I said, a little bit more on the nuts and bolts. As Beth said, the agenda is for the full six days. There's three issues identified for discussion this afternoon and tomorrow here in Ketchikan. Renewable energy and young-growth topics. Then we have Friday, which is day three, and I'll get back to that in a minute.

And then next week in Juneau, Monday and Tuesday we have additional topics on the agenda that are identified in here. The application of the Roadless Rule and then harvest and components of the wildlife conservation strategy and other areas. So those are the issues as Beth indicated that she identified upfront and we'll focus on those.

Again, next Wednesday, is day six. So really Beth wanted to provide those two full days as opportunities for if there were things that were burning topics for you, that are issues that you had raised in objections letters already in the process. It can't be, you know, brand-new stuff, but things that

Page 44

were raised in the objections process by you as an objector but you hadn't seen yet on the agendas for days one, two, four and five. There's an opportunity to suggest those for discussion on day three and day six.

I think a lot of you are already taking advantage of this or availing yourselves of this opportunity. So the two ways that it's possible to raise those issues is we're asking that by 5:00 o'clock today, the end of the day today, the workday, you either email in what those issues are that you would like to discuss and, if possible, some information about the resolution you're hoping to be able to discuss at the table. That can be emailed in to the email address that's on Page 14 of the agenda packet. The last page of the agenda packet. It's the email address you have been using for the objections process.

If you're here in the room and you're an objector and interested person and you want to suggest something, we just have a super simple half-page form where you just jot your name down and what it is you'd like to discuss.

Then what we'll be doing after the close of business today is pooling all those together and Beth will be looking through them and we'll be

Page 45

designing the agendas for day three and day six. What we're planning to do is to have those available tomorrow morning so you can see what's planned for this coming Friday here in Ketchikan and the following Wednesday in Juneau and we'll post those on the website as well so that people who aren't here in the room in Ketchikan will have access to it tomorrow morning. So that's our plan.

The final thing we want to talk about is getting going on the issues and the issue discussions. As I said earlier, we've got these issues that are starting discussion today at 1:00. That will be renewable energy development. We know that there's people that are -- six days is a lot of time for these meetings and not all of you who are interested can be here, so people will be coming and going. So we're really committed to starting those issue discussions at the time we said we would on the agenda.

If, for example, we finish something early, we're not going to roll right into the next thing. We'll wait until that start time so that people who are tuning in on the phone or are going to appear in the meeting room for that time, we won't be jumping ahead of them.

And then just to take a look at the



Computer Matrix, LLC Phone: 907-243-0668
135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501 Fax: 907-243-1473 Email: sahile@gci.net

Page 46

agenda. If you look on Page 2, Issue 1, you'll see how we're planning to organize the conversation. For each issue, starting this afternoon with renewable energy, the objectors and the interested parties who are listed in the agenda for that topic in the Attachment 1 will come to the table here.

If you're not listed as an objector or an interested party, then you would seat yourself in the back of the room for that topic. And people will be on the phone. We'll have some objectors and interested parties that will participate in the discussion by the phone. So it's those parties who will be participating in the discussion with Beth on those topics.

We've got five little bullet points we're going to run through just to keep organized, so Beth will give an introduction to the issue. She has some things that she wants to say to frame it and to sort of focus the discussion on the topics that she would like to spend time on discussing with you. Then we'll have an opportunity after that for each of the objectors to present their perspective on the issue and suggestions for resolution.

That time we are going to ask be a maximum of five minutes per objector and that's where

Page 47

Dru comes in. She's going to help us with those little signs to say one minute to go. The reason for that is we want to have -- two reasons really. We want to make sure that everybody has sort of an equal opportunity to speak and sort of lay the groundwork for their thoughts and equally as important we want to make sure that we can get past just those opening statements in a relatively reasonable amount of time and leave ample time for discussion.

The cool and new and interesting thing about this process is that discussion time. You've already made so many of your statements in writing and they've all been read thoroughly, so we want to get past those kind of just this is my position on this to frame that up enough so that it lays the groundwork for the discussion but leave ample time for discussion. So that's why we've designed it this way.

So each objector will have that opportunity for a maximum of five minutes, then we'll ask if there's any interested persons. They would each have that opportunity for five minutes as well. Then we'll have time for discussion and that will be facilitated, but we want that to be a good conversation with everybody easily contributing and then closing with any questions that Beth might have and a final

Page 48

summary.

So that is our approach to each of the issues. Each of the issues right now basically has about a half a day scheduled for that today, tomorrow and next Monday and Tuesday. Friday and Wednesday we have yet to see what those agendas will be.

Go ahead, Owen. What question do you have? I have a little bit more to cover, but go ahead, Owen, and let's clarify.

MR. GRAHAM: When and how are you going to pick the order of the commentors?

MS. CAULFIELD: That's a really good question and actually I was just planning to do that alphabetically. So working through my little alphabetical list of the objectors and then the interested persons.

MR. GRAHAM: Okay. Yeah, because like the first one coming up is this renewable energy development. I'm not an expert on renewable energy. We support what AP&T has done and I'd like to just give my five minutes to Bob Grimm so he could do a better job of explaining the concerns rather than have me come in there.

MS. CAULFIELD: Right. Okay, thanks, Owen. So actually that is a great segue into the last

Page 49

part of what I wanted to explain. We started hearing yesterday, frankly, that there were other people that felt the way that you did. It was, well, maybe I don't want to give my own five minutes, I would like to designate someone else to do that speaking for me.

So in some of those cases several objectors have designated an individual and in some cases there are several who designated the same individual to represent them as the objector. So that was discussed in terms of how that complied with the guidance for this process, et cetera.

So the way that that can be accommodated is that during each objectors allotted time for their initial comments -- so, for example, when I call Alaska Forest Association, the spokesperson that you've designated to present for you on that can present your perspective on the issue. But we are still going to go objector by objector, five minutes by five minutes.

So, in other words, we're not going to say six objectors wants this person to speak for them, therefore they get 30 minutes total. We're going to stick with our five minutes by five minutes so that we're giving each objector the opportunity.

MR. GRAHAM: Why is that?



Computer Matrix, LLC Phone: 907-243-0668
135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501 Fax: 907-243-1473 Email: sahile@gci.net

Page 50

MS. CAULFIELD: So let me keep going and then we'll open for questions again. So if the perspective is the same as what's already been stated, we're hoping we can -- you would say this objector agrees with the former statement that I made. In addition to that, if there's anything unique about the objector that you're representing, you would bring that forward at that time.

The other piece of it, and I want to explain this piece too before questions, during the following issue discussion with the reviewing officer, then only the designated spokesperson would participate in that. So if you've designated somebody -- if you're an objector and you've designated another party to speak for you on renewable energy, say for example this afternoon, then it's that designated spokesperson who would be involved in the conversation with Beth. There wouldn't be an opportunity for you to say, well, they're no longer speaking for me. I want to come up to the table. It's the structure that needs to happen in order to meet the intent of the process.

So I guess I just wanted to clarify that with you all so you can make the decision as objectors if you want to have someone speak for you or if you want to reserve your own opportunity to speak

Page 51

for your objecting status yourself. And given that understanding, you know, you can reconfirm if there's a designated spokesperson for you or if you're going to speak for yourself.

With that, I want to open it up to questions. I can help answer those, but, Beth, I may need your help in answering some of those too because of your familiarity with the process.

Owen, go ahead. Questions on anything Beth or I have said in this last session.

MR. GRAHAM: I'm just curious why I can't give my five minutes to Bob Grimm to talk about an issue that he's more knowledgeable than me. Why do you want to limit him to five minutes regardless of whether I give up my time? You've already set aside enough time for everybody to talk for five minutes.

MS. PENDLETON: Thank you for your question, Owen. I think as Jan explained, if you are designating Bob to speak on behalf of AFA, he will have on behalf of AFA five minutes to share any comments or remarks.

MR. GRAHAM: Oh, okay. So he will get 10 minutes altogether?

MS. PENDLETON: He will get five minutes for AFA and then on behalf of AP&T he will also

Page 52

get five minutes.

MR. GRAHAM: Oh, okay. That's fine. That's fine then. Thank you.

MS. CAULFIELD: Thanks. I apologize if that wasn't clear. He will have that time. It's just that we're going to take you in order I guess is the main way to say it. So we may jump in and out of Bob speaking if he's speaking for several parties. It may not be all consecutive.

Chris.

MR. MAISCH: Yeah, along those lines. For the State, we'll have several people online. So would I start the conversation and say I would like so and so, whoever is going to represent us on that particular issue, to speak to it? How do you want to handle that?

MS. CAULFIELD: Within the five-minute timeframe.....

MR. MAISCH: Yeah.

MS. CAULFIELD: .....there might be several speakers?

MR. MAISCH: Do you want me to start out and just I'm going to ask Lance from DOT to cover this topic and then that's it. I'm done, I guess, it sounds like at that point and then would have that

Page 53

individual cover it.

MS. CAULFIELD: Yeah, that would be fine, but it's within the five minutes.....

MR. MAISCH: Sure.

MS. CAULFIELD: .....all of the speakers. Yeah, that would work well.

MR. MAISCH: Do I stay at the table then or do I go to the back of the room?

MS. CAULFIELD: Oh, I'd stay where you are.

MR. MAISCH: Okay. That's cool. Can I go on with an additional question.....

MS. CAULFIELD: Sure.

MR. MAISCH: .....for Beth this time. When you were talking about resolution options, it would be helpful for me if you could maybe describe some examples of things you might consider suitable options. Like one thing I was thinking would potential additional analysis in the FEIS be something that might be considered a resolution option?

MS. PENDLETON: So thanks for your question, Chris. You know, at this point any remedy or resolution that any objector or interested person brings forward will be considered.

MS. MAISCH: Thank you.



Computer Matrix, LLC Phone: 907-243-0668
135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501 Fax: 907-243-1473 Email: sahile@gci.net

Page 54

MS. CAULFIELD: Thanks. I'll check here in the room if there's any other questions for Beth or myself on any of this last session and then I'll go to the phone.

Go ahead, Tony. Thanks.

MR. GALLEGOS: Tony with KIC. My question is who can be engaged with the discussion portion? If I, as an interested person, do not take advantage of the five-minute comment period for that particular item during this discussion period, would I still be allowed to be engaged?

MS. CAULFIELD: I'm just looking to make sure I'm not saying the wrong thing, but my understanding is yes. Everybody is nodding their heads. So thanks for the clarifying question there, Tony.

Let me check with any of the objectors or interested person who are on the phone if there's any questions you have about this process that we're going to begin after lunch together. Any questions for Beth or for me about the process and the intent of this work together this week and next?

MR. CLARK: Hi, this is Jim Clark. I just had one clarifying question probably for Earl. Are we completely replacing the 2008 Amended Plan or

Page 55

are we simply amending the 2008 Amended Plan?

MR. STEWART: So this is Earl. Jim, I appreciate the question. This is not a Forest Plan revision. This is a Forest Plan Amendment and it does have a very focused amendment scope. Is that helpful, sir?

MR. CLARK: Yes. Does that mean that those portions of the 2008 Amended Plan that are not changed by this amendment remain in effect?

MR. STEWART: That would be affirmative, sir.

MR. CLARK: Thank you.

MS. CAULFIELD: Thank you for your question, Jim. Is there any other objectors or interested persons on the telephone with questions for Beth or myself or Earl? Any other questions at this time?

MS. CULLINEY: I have a clarifying question. I'm wondering should I email a question on kind of a sub-topic for this overarching issue of the timeframe? I have kind of a sub-topic. I just want to make sure it's discussed. Does that make sense?

MS. CAULFIELD: Is that Susan?

MS. CULLINEY: Yeah.

MS. CAULFIELD: Susan, let me just see

Page 56

if I'm understanding. You have a comment about the timeframe for transition. You're not a hundred percent confident it's going to come up tomorrow, so you want to make sure that it's considered and reserve it for day three possibly. I guess my suggestion is to go ahead and send it in as a real quick email. When we look at it, Beth will either say, oh, yes, that will come up under this that we already have calendared on the agenda and if not then she'll consider it for day three or day six. So cover your bases and just go ahead and send in something brief on that. Thanks.

Anyone else with questions?

MR. CLARK: This is Jim Clark. Would you go over again how those of us on the phone could suggest issues for day three.

MS. CAULFIELD: Yes, Jim, absolutely. So if you have an issue for day three or day six that you'd like to suggest, if you have your agenda, on page 14 of the agenda there's an email there and I will read it, but I want to point out where it is on the written agenda so you can see it. It's the email that you've been using all along for the objections process when you've submitted objections letters, et cetera.

So I'll read it out loud, but it's that same email. The email is objections-alaska-regional-

Page 57

office@fs.fed.us. So is there anyone who needs me to repeat that? Again, it's on page 14 of the agenda, the last page. So we do need to receive those today by 5:00 o'clock this afternoon so that we can look those over and generate those agendas for the coming days.

Any other questions.

(No comments)

MS. CAULFIELD: Okay. Do you have anything else to say at this point?

MS. PENDLETON: I think the only thing -- because we are going to take a little bit longer lunch break and since we're going to be moving into our first discussion, that will be around renewable energy development, so I'd encourage each -- you'll see the issue and I've gone ahead and framed the issue for renewable energy. These are some specific things that I encourage you to address for those objectors and interested persons who will be making remarks to try to address that issue. If you have other things you want to bring up around the topic, that's fine, but at a minimum please try to address that issue. This is an area that I'm seeking further clarification, understanding and also trying to seek some opportunities for resolution.

So have a good lunch break and we will



Computer Matrix, LLC Phone: 907-243-0668
135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501 Fax: 907-243-1473 Email: sahile@gci.net

Page 58

get started. We've got a lot of work to do this afternoon, but we'll get started back here at 1:00 o'clock.

MS. CAULFIELD: Thanks, Beth. Thanks very much to everybody. We'll see you at 1:00 o'clock. Those of you on the phone, we are going to hang up the phone over lunchtime, but we'll dial back in about 10 minutes before 1:00 and reconnect with you. Thanks very much.

(Off record)

(On record)

MS. CAULFIELD: Welcome back everybody. We're going to go ahead and get started with our afternoon session. Again, we're moving into the part of the meeting this afternoon where we're going to be working on one of the issues that was raised during the objection resolution process and that's renewable energy development.

I don't see any new people who are identified as objectors or interested persons joining us here in the room, but I do want to check -- welcome the people on the phone and just check if there's anyone new on the phone who was not on this morning on the call who is identified as an objector or an interested person for this discussion of renewable

Page 59

energy development. The list of those parties are on Page 8 of the agenda.

If we already spoke this morning, then I know that you're still there, but I just wanted to give an opportunity if there's anyone new on the phone who is identified as an objector or interested person for this issue on Page 8 of the agenda.

MS. RUSHMORE: Hi. Yes. This is Carol Rushmore with the City and Borough of Wrangell.

MS. CAULFIELD: Great, Carol. Thanks. This is Jan Caulfield. I appreciate that. Anybody else?

(No response)

MS. CAULFIELD: Okay. Thanks, Carol. Thanks for joining.

MR. GRAHAM: Was that Carol Rushmore?

MS. CAULFIELD: Carol Rushmore. I'm sorry. There's too many buttons to push. I didn't get there fast enough. But, yes, thank you. Carol Rushmore from the City of Wrangell is joining in for the afternoon on the phone.

Okay. Let's just see if there's any questions that came up over lunch. I heard one clarifying question that I know Chris has. Would you like to ask that, Chris, and then we'll.....

Page 60

MR. MAISCH: Yeah. Thanks for the opportunity to ask that. I was just reviewing my notes and it wasn't clear to me once we got into the discussion phase after each objector has had their five minutes to present their points, is it only that objector that can speak during that phase or if there's another person that might be better to answer a question you might ask, can they ask for a different person to respond?

MS. PENDLETON: I've asked that the objector, the principal objector respond.

MR. MAISCH: Okay. Thank you.

MS. PENDLETON: And let me also state though if there's a need at a point to check in, if you've got other folks that are going to be spokespersons in addition to you as you present that issue, if you need to check in, let me know and we can take a short break.

MR. MAISCH: Okay. Thank you. Because I intend to have someone from DOT talk to this topic instead of me. So, thanks.

MS. CAULFIELD: Right. And you'll notice that we're meeting from 1:00 to 5:00 now. We did not show a break in there. Clearly we will take a break. We just want to see where it fits in best and

Page 61

have that flexibility. So we won't make you be here for four hours without a break.

So I guess I'd like to go ahead and begin looking at renewable energy development. Again it's on Page 8 of the agenda. Beth had called your attention to that issue statement before lunch especially so that those who are listed on that page and are participating as objectors and interested persons can kind of focus their remarks around that.

We are going to go through the steps that are shown there with an introduction to the issue by Beth and then we'll enter the part where I'm going to go alphabetically through those who are listed as objectors and then secondly interested persons and have a maximum of five minutes per objector to give their perspective and any recommended resolutions.

As we were discussing before lunch, there are some cases where some of the objectors have identified a designated spokesperson. I think we're going to see that soon. Bob Grimm from AP&T is going to speak for a number of the objectors. So we will call each of the objectors in order and a maximum of five minutes per objector.

Bob, if you're speaking several times, then during those times I'm going to ask you what is



Computer Matrix, LLC Phone: 907-243-0668
135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501 Fax: 907-243-1473 Email: sahile@gci.net

Page 62

the perspective of the party you're speaking for on this issue. We're asking that objectors not continually just take five minutes to restate what perhaps was said already in five minutes. We're eager, all of us I think, to get to the opportunity to have discussion. So that's our intent there.

So with that I think I'll go ahead and turn it.....

MR. CLARK: This is Jim Clark. I just wanted to let you know that a bunch of us here have called in and just so you can check our names down.

MS. CAULFIELD: Thanks, Jim. The way that we're working is if I spoke with you this morning, I'm assuming you're sticking with us through the afternoon. We did have Carol Rushmore from the City of Wrangell also join in. She was our new caller this afternoon. But I appreciate that very much.

So, Beth, let's go ahead and turn it to you for your introduction to the issue.

MS. PENDLETON: Thank you and welcome back. What I'm going to do with each of the issues is just do a little framing and then also just state the particular aspects that I'm hoping to hear for those of you that are going to be speaking and sharing your issues, concerns and proposed remedy to try to address

Page 63

in your remarks.

So as we heard from Sue Howle this morning, renewable energy was identified as a significant issue for Plan Amendment based on comments that were received in the five-year review of the Forest Plan and during the scoping period. Those comments indicated a desire to see the Forest Service promote the development of renewable energy projects that were compatible with National Forest System purposes and to ensure that the planning, construction and operation of energy projects protect and effectively use National Forest System lands and resources. This will help Southeast Alaska communities reduce dependence on fossil fuels as well as help to stimulate economic development and reduce carbon emissions.

The five-year review identified a need to improve the ability of proponents of renewable energy development projects such as hydropower, geothermal and wave energy projects to obtain permits from the Forest Service. It also indicated that the 2008 Forest Plan direction regarding transportation and utility systems and the transportation and utility system overlay land use designations was overly complex, confusing and difficult to implement, creating

Page 64

an impediment to the development of renewable energy projects such as hydropower and other types of renewable energy.

Alleviating plan impediments to renewable energy projects was a key consideration during the Forest Plan Amendment process to reduce the adverse effects of high energy costs on economic diversification and sustainable economic development in Southeast Alaska.

I want to talk a little bit about the selected alternative. The selected alternative removes the transportation and utility system overlay LUD and includes new management direction that is intended to alleviate plan-related impediments to renewable energy production.

The previous TUS LUD management prescriptions is replaced by plan components that provide management direction for renewable energy and transportation system corridors. This new direction provides for a priority consideration of renewable energy projects. The priority is based on whether the projects lead to a decrease in the number of Southeast Alaska communities powered by local generators, increase an energy capacity, efficiency or storage at existing projects or an export of the renewable energy

Page 65

resources without power benefitting Southeast Alaska communities.

So the area that would be really helpful for me to hear from each of those that are going to be speaking as objectors and interested persons is to address this: A recognition that although there are additional aspects to the objections related to renewable energy development, the issue that I'd really like you to further discuss and address is the contention raised by some objectors that the Plan Amendment failed to develop sufficient renewable energy criteria to provide for a predictable, repeatable and objective process for decision-making on renewable energy projects.

So that's the piece that I'd really hope that you'll try to address in your remarks. Jan, I think we're ready to begin with the first.

MS. CAULFIELD: Okay. That's great, Beth. Thank you. Dru is going to help us with keeping track of time. The first objector, going alphabetically, is Alaska Forest Association. Owen, I understand for this issue anyway you've asked Bob Grimm to speak for the Alaska Forest Association, is that correct?

MR. GRAHAM: Yes.



Computer Matrix, LLC Phone: 907-243-0668
135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501 Fax: 907-243-1473 Email: sahile@gci.net

Page 66

MS. CAULFIELD: Okay, thanks. Bob.
MR. GRIMM: Good morning, everybody. I have some talking points on the renewable energy. First of all, the transportation and utility system should not be eliminated in the name of renewable energy. As I read and listen to you, Beth, it's not going to help renewable energy and it's a poor planning adoption to get rid of the TUS.
There are some types of projects that need the TUS overlay to be able to exist. For example, Angoon recently was working through trying to get a new airport. Without a TUS that would not have been able for the community to have an airport.
The transportation corridor or the new term that you're using for the TUS is too limiting. One of the things that the FCC is pushing is that rural areas are going to need faster and faster broadband. When you get faster and faster, it moves away from wireless types of solutions to fiber optics.
In the future, when we get to 25 up and 3 down in rural communities, right now we're going to need fiber optics. How do we put these in place if there's not a TUS corridor available for us to do it. So, in short, the TUS overlay should be preserved and with the addition of a renewable energy overlay LUD.

Page 67

The U.S. Forest Service should use the renewable energy overlay LUD it previously represented it would use rather than the proposed Forest-wide standards and guidelines. The standards and guidelines are too vague, lack clear criteria, fail to sufficiently prioritize renewable energy development over other land uses and give the U.S. Forest Service complete subjective discretion over how and where energy developments can occur.
This is not consistent with good planning. The U.S. Forest Service previously agreed to use the renewable energy overlay in its March 2nd, 2015 letter from Forrest Cole to Alaska Power and Telephone. You know, what happened to that promise.
The U.S. Forest Service issued the strategic energy framework with the expressed purpose of trying to -- where we're at right now is we've got to move away from fossil fuels. The intent is to open up the National Forest for renewable energy development.
One of the tactical principles is to provide a pragmatic type of analysis in contrast to a case by case. There's many times here when you're going to have to make a tradeoff. You have a scenic waterfall which is also a hydro site. The two aren't

Page 68

compatible. What do you do? Do you want to reduce carbon with hydroelectric? What about the scenic waterfall that's on either side of the project? So these tradeoffs have to be made. With the renewable energy overlay the decision on those tradeoffs is renewable energy first if possible and consistent with the rest of the plan. That's what we would like to see.
Where are we at?
MS. FESTER: One minute.
MR. GRIMM: Okay. Even with a robust renewable energy overlay, the renewable energy project cannot be developed due to the Roadless Rule. We're in the midst of that. When somebody files a permit for a hydro project, FERC creates a Federal water power reservation. That Federal water power reservation is designated on the Forest. However, that is not triggered until FERC issues a license and conveys that reservation to the licensee. FERC is unable to issue a license if it's not consistent with the Forest Plan.
MS. CAULFIELD: Thanks, Bob. Thank you, Dru. That's five minutes. I guess what I want to say is I think in the discussion there's going to be ample opportunity to continue into all of those points that you're making and additional ones that you have

Page 69

there. So that's our intent.
Let me move on. The next objector is the Alaska Miners Association. Frank Bergstrom was on the phone. Frank, I just wanted to confirm with you. I had seen this in an earlier -- or my impression was that you were also designating Bob to speak for you, but I want to clarify and confirm that.
MR. BERGSTROM: That is very clear and I would like to confirm that.
MS. CAULFIELD: Okay. All right. Thank you, Frank. Bob, I guess I would encourage you to sort of adopt the perspective of the Alaska Miners Association and especially if there's anything unique to their position on this that you could bring forward as their spokesperson. Go ahead.
MR. GRIMM: I believe that their thoughts are consistent with ours, that renewable energy is a wide policy type of decision. Are we going to encourage it or are we not going to encourage it. I think most of the 250, if not more, comments you received on the update was related to renewable energy. There's a large inventory of renewable energy on this Forest. I'm not sure you even know where they are. If we're going to manage that renewable energy, we need to manage them like we would any other resource on the



Computer Matrix, LLC Phone: 907-243-0668
135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501 Fax: 907-243-1473 Email: sahile@gci.net

Page 70

National Forest.
If you look at the Forest and Range Land Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974, it's a requirement that that renewable resource be assessed, but this Forest has been in a historical inefficiency. It's been focused on timber. This is a different day. We have global warming, we have climate change, we're facing a lot of limitations on carbon and now we've got to look at these renewable resources that are in the National Forest for part of the solution.
The projects can't be developed because of the Roadless Rule, which makes it inconsistent for FERC to issue a license if the project requires a road. So there needs to be some modification to the Roadless Rule that would allow renewable resources to be developed on the National Forest.
Also a change like this would be supported by Public Law 106-511, Title VI, which is an authorization for renewable electric intertie throughout Southeast Alaska. That isn't even mentioned as a policy type of consideration that was taken into account by the Forest Service.
Without an amendment to the Roadless Rule to allow for access to renewable energy, the TLMP will be inconsistent with Federal clean energy and

Page 71

energy security policy and even the U.S. Forest Service's own strategic energy forecast, as well as the local and regional preferences of the commentors that commented on your Plan Amendment.
By coming up with a renewable energy plan which cannot be implemented due to the Roadless Rule and by failing to propose modification of an incompatible Roadless Rule, the U.S. Forest Service appears to be operating in contrast to Executive Order 12866, which specifies that each Agency shall avoid regulations that are inconsistent, incompatible or duplicative of its other regulations.
Where am I at?
MS. FENSTER: A minute and a half.
MR. GRIMM: Okay. Also in the Plan Amendment the U.S. Forest Service should eliminate language which prioritizes and deprioritizes projects based upon the type of developer or market. The U.S. Forest Service is not an energy regulatory force and should not attempt to act in such a role. By attempting to act like a market regulatory force, the U.S. is acting contrary.
EO 12866, each Agency shall avoid regulations that are inconsistent, incompatible or duplicative with those of other Federal agencies. So

Page 72

by stepping into this role, deciding who can build what and who can't, you're duplicating other regulatory agencies that are in that business and, frankly, better informed.
In a general trend in the regulation of energy, communications and other things is that the markets are the markets. The regulator doesn't try to define what markets are important and what markets are not. The regulator doesn't define whether a public agency should develop the project or it should be an investor-owned type of agency. That is poor policy. And those changes of prioritizing and deprioritizing have no business being in the current amendment.
Thank you.
MS. CAULFIELD: Thanks, Bob. I'm going to ask -- Alaska Power and Telephone is the next objector. I'm wondering, have you made it through your foundational points?
MR GRIMM: No.
MS. CAULFIELD: Okay. So we'll hear from Bob on Alaska Power and Telephone and then the next speaker after that will be Carol from the City of Wrangell.
MR. GRIMM: Thank you for everybody's patience. So to pick up with where I was, there are

Page 73

Federal regulatory agencies that already makes those kind of decisions on markets and the type of developers that can participate in those markets.
This prioritation bias is inconsistent with U.S. policy and even the U.S. Forest Service Strategic Energy Framework. The Strategic Energy Framework specifically states that the U.S. Forest Service will use public lands it manages to support national, not just community, energy objectives. The Forest Service will proactively further transform the nation's energy supply and the use of renewable energy and other alternative fuels for addressing national energy security needs.
Clearly climate change is not a Southeast Alaska problem. Emissions are not a Southeast Alaska problem. Climate change is a global issue and by trying to tackle Federal policy, which is to go after climate change and carbon, and then myopically say it only matters if we're doing that in Southeast Alaska is inconsistent. The problem is bigger than that and the arena has expanded.
Elimination of carbon in Southeast Alaska is elimination of a ton of carbon in the climate of the world. So by indicating that it only matters if it benefits Southeast Alaska is inconsistent with that



Computer Matrix, LLC Phone: 907-243-0668
135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501 Fax: 907-243-1473 Email: sahile@gci.net

Page 74

concept. Carbon emissions are a global situation, not a Southeast Alaska situation.

In response to the comments on RENA, the U.S. Forest Service claims it's bias towards certain developers, markets is consistent with the recommendation of the TAC. This response is highly inaccurate and deceptive and should be corrected by the U.S. Forest Service.

Developing renewable energy recommendations was outside the TAC charter guide and the TAC could not do so. U.S. Forest Service Jason Anderson told TAC members they could not develop renewable energy recommendations for this very reason. The TAC did not develop renewable energy recommendations and did not develop prioritizations based upon markets or developers.

The TAC did not have access to information regarding renewable energy upon which a decision could be made. The large majority of the TAC members lacked meaningful utility and renewable energy development experience required to develop responsible energy development recommendations.

The current U.S. Forest Service prioritization language is meaningless in terms of establishing enforceable priorities. All new renewable

Page 75

energy projects in Southeast Alaska would provide economic benefits to Southeast Alaska communities by virtue of contributing to direct and indirect employment, local supply chain expenditures, in some cases the payment of taxes, all new developments allow for improvement, economic dispatch which contributes to increased renewable energy capacity storage or energy at existing projects.

MS. FENSTER: One minute.

MR. GRIMM: No community will probably in Southeast Alaska that's in a microgrid will ever be totally free of some diesel for backup, so it will always remain necessary. Some projects will sell both energy within Alaska and some outside Alaska. Some projects which may initially be developed now to sell energy only to Alaska in the future could be selling some of their output when they have surplus to markets outside of Alaska if and when a future intertie to B.C. is developed.

MS. FENSTER: You've got 14 seconds.

MR. GRIMM: Oh. I'm finished then.

(Laughter)

MS. CAULFIELD: Thank you, Bob, and thanks, Dru, for helping with that. So Carol from the City of Wrangell. Carol Rushmore.

Page 76

MS. RUSHMORE: Thank you. I certainly don't have the technical expertise as the previous speaker. He did address some of the concerns as the City and Borough of Wrangell. For example, these provide access to renewable projects through roadless areas and how the Plan can address that.

One thing the City is concerned about is in the valuation of renewable energy resource projects, that social and economic objectives or criteria receive a very high priority. The language right now, I think Beth you had read earlier, actually is changed to really address very clearly that there is a special economic benefit to these communities and that is one of the high priorities.

Thank you.

MS. CAULFIELD: Carol, thanks very much. I'm going to take a one-second break to consult with Beth on something.

(Pause)

MS. CAULFIELD: Again, continuing on down the list. I have Jim Clark as the next objector for this issue. It was my understanding that Jim had also designated you, Bob, to speak. So this is that situation where we're in a please don't restate, but if there was anything unique to that particular objector

Page 77

that you wanted to mention, you can, or you could say, as Carol basically did in a way, you've covered points that address that objector's perspective.

MR. GRIMM: I'm trying very hard not to repeat myself.

(Laughter)

MR. GRIMM: Back again to the larger picture. The U.S. Forest Service fails to address emissions avoidance, which can occur by using clean energy from Alaska rather than coal and natural gas-fired generation produced elsewhere in the Lower 48.

The renewable energy in Alaska right now is stranded and isolated, but the social cost to carbon, which is a standard calculation, which is used by many to define what the benefit or the costs are of a coal plant, is the cost of a hydro project, the benefit of the reduction in the social cost of carbon.

So I did a quick calculation and I estimate that just using some of the projects that are available and the technology is wave, tidal, wind and hydro, the value in just the -- not the product, not the electricity, the value in the reduction in the social cost of carbon in Southeast Alaska is a billion dollar thing. Actually my number was 17 billion.

What's going to happen as the low



Computer Matrix, LLC Phone: 907-243-0668
135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501 Fax: 907-243-1473 Email: sahile@gci.net

Page 78

hanging fruit in the Lower 48 and other countries is picked -- and California is having that problem right now, they can't get enough renewable -- Alaska's renewable resources are going to become very valuable and the market is going to drive an intertie to be able to capture that value. That is going to be good. And that emphasis on emissions avoidance is missing in the Plan and we think it should be in there.

It's clearly discussed in the strategic energy framework. The value of emissions and trying to come up with a streamlined way of developing renewable energy projects on the National Forest be developed.

The U.S. Forest Service received substantial comments regarding this issue, but did not address them in the EIS documents or in the Draft ROD, which I think would be a violation of NEPA.

Back to Beth's point. The way the Plan is written right now is vague and will be very subjective and that's a problem. The 2008 Amended Forest Plan did not contain a renewable energy plan.

As seen in a December 11th, 2009 email from administrative assistant to then Deputy Undersecretary of Agriculture for Natural Resources Jay Jensen, the Forest Supervisor for the Tongass Forest, Forrest Cole, Jay wants to be able to talk about a

Page 79

transition plan at this meeting with R.D. Where are we at with it and how this syncs up with joint projects. I also know that a hydro strategy is coming at some point. It might make sense to think about how this all fits together. What is the host of job opportunities coming off the Forest from traditional timber to energy, biomass, hydro, to restoration, recreation, tourism, fish and marine business? You're probably already there in your thinking.

Okay, that sounds pretty clear to me. September 23rd, 2009. Email from Sherry Shelley, Director of Ecosystem Planning to Forrest Cole. In regards to hydro and roadless, as you are aware, we are getting some pretty mixed messages from several sources higher than the Forest. One hand says push hydro, the other hand says stay out of roadless. All the new applications as opposed to repermitting facilities that are already in place. I need to know where everyone is going before the Tongass or a proponent, which is one sitting right here, sinks a ton of money into a project that essentially can't be licensed or built in a manner that's consistent with the Forest Plan.

That concludes my remarks.

MS. CAULFIELD: Thank you, Bob. Holly Harris from Earthjustice. Thanks, Holly.

Page 80

MS. HARRIS: Very briefly. I don't have much to offer, but on behalf of the Earthjustice objectors, first we applaud the Forest Service. The Agency is right to be encouraging renewable energy projects because of both the beneficial effects to the environment, to climate change, and because they can provide our communities more affordable energy.

Those projects need to be sited and developed in the context of sound stewardship of the Tongass. That includes community input from locals as well as environmental protections. I heard the term subjective in terms of the Amended Forest Plan and we would agree with that. As written, it appears to the eye of the beholder. We need a little bit better understanding. Removing wholesale environmental protections, if that's in fact what's happening, is only going to increase controversy. So let's be making smart choices, sound stewardship and finding the right places for these projects. In doing so, we would certainly applaud those efforts.

Beth spoke in terms of criteria and very briefly I'd like to touch on biomass. In terms of developing these projects, biomass is different than the others in this list. The Agency should not be promoting biomass. It accelerates climate change. It

Page 81

is harmful to the human health and the environment. It is harmful to the most vulnerable in our population; our children, our elders, those of compromised immune systems. So biomass should be treated separately and should not be given the same favorable standing as other environmental renewable energy projects.

At the risk of stating the obvious, clearcutting our old-growth forest for biomass is not a renewable energy.

Touching briefly on the Roadless Rule, I just want to be clear that we do have a separate day devoted to that, specifically the interplay of the Roadless Rule and hydropower. So I hope we stick to our agenda rather than kind of morphing into a new discussion.

With that I will say nothing else.

MS. CAULFIELD: Appreciate it, Holly. And, yes, that is what we will do. Application of the Roadless Rule will be on for tomorrow. First things first, Alaska Foundation is the next objector. Frank Bergstrom is on the phone from them. Again, I think he's probably designated Bob to speak.

So I'm just going to go on here to say that there's several other objectors who have also designated Bob Grimm to speak for them. Bob, if you've



Computer Matrix, LLC Phone: 907-243-0668
135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501 Fax: 907-243-1473 Email: sahile@gci.net

Page 82

concluded your remarks and what I would like to suggest is that unless there's something unique to one of those objectors, unique to their perspective that they've asked you to say, I would suggest that you not restate or even continue remarks at this point, but bring it up in discussion.

I'm eager to get to discussion and I'd like to suggest that. So if the parties who are objectors who have asked Bob to speak are comfortable with that, and I can let you caucus on it to make sure, but I just want to make sure that everybody has an opportunity to get some basic foundational things on the table and then we can get into the discussion. But I'm checking in with you as the designated spokesperson.

MR. GRIMM: I just have three paragraphs and then I'll be finished and willing to go into discussion.

MS. CAULFIELD: Is that all right with you?

MS. PENDLETON: Yes.

MS. CAULFIELD: Thanks, Bob.

MR. GRIMM: Again, I'm not repeating myself here. The U.S. Strategic Energy Framework specifies that we need to be working on this. If a

Page 83

FERC process is available, there's going to be meaningful public comment and local concerns will be addressed.

A great many of the Alaska parties of interest, including utilities, communities, industry, organizations and non-profits, have jointly requested an overlay LUD for renewable energy.

The U.S. Forest Service has not received support for the Forest-wide standards and guidelines that I can find from any party of interest. Using an LUD overlay would be consistent with what has been requested by key stakeholders, including over 250 public comments.

The standards and guidelines aren't clear in terms of whether the S&G has priority or the underlying LUD has priority. The S&Gs state that the Chapter 5 Plan component, renewable energy, takes precedence over Chapter 3 and 4, management direction, yet they also indicate that Chapters 3 and 4 take precedent via consideration of the LUD.

The result is an effect of circular reasoning, which is resolved through the total discretion of the U.S. Forest Service on a case-by-case basis rather than through a predictable, repeatable, transparent, objective process. This circular

Page 84

situation appears to be again in violation of Executive Order 12866, which specifies each Agency shall avoid regulations that are inconsistent, incompatible or duplicative with its other regulations. Each Agency shall draft regulations to be simple and easy to understand with a goal of minimizing the potential for uncertainty and litigation arising from uncertainty.

That's all I have. Thank you.

MS. CAULFIELD: Yeah, thanks, Bob. Okay. Our next objector, Greater Southeast Alaska Conservation Community, Larry Edwards. Thanks, Larry.

MR. EDWARDS: I'm Larry Edwards. I'm a staff for Greenpeace as well as on the board of GSACC. We had five groups altogether on this objection.

Regarding renewable energy and also for other topics slated for this resolution meeting, our objection letter speaks for itself. For that reason I will have little if anything to say except for introductory remarks on this topic and others that come up later.

In our objection letter under Objection Point 9, we ask the Reviewing Officer to direct the Forest Plan's responsible official, which is the Tongass Forest Supervisor, to remove biomass from the list of acceptable renewable energy sources covered by

Page 85

the Plan. We again urge the Reviewing Officer to do that. I'm referencing their FEIS Page 3-322 where there's a list and also in the Forest Plan 7-49.

We raise that objection because the FEIS fails to distinguish between zero emission renewable energy sources and biomass combustion, which is the source of carbon dioxide and other pollutants. Concerning carbon dioxide, the Forest Service's Biomass Program does not satisfy EPA's definition of what they call qualified biomass, which is biomass feedstock that is demonstrated as a means to control increases of CO2 levels in the atmosphere.

Although EPA's rule is not final, the Forest Service still must explain the relationship between emissions stemming from its biomass program and regulation under the Clean Air Act. With the possible exception of sawmill waste, the carbon dioxide output per energy produced is higher for biomass than with fossil fuel, particularly for electricity generation, but even if the use is for heat. The problem is greater for small diameter trees and even if the source is from thinning.

Nonetheless, as pointed out in our Objection Point 8, the FEIS considers biomass energy to be carbon neutral on the basis of the Forest Service's



Computer Matrix, LLC Phone: 907-243-0668
135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501 Fax: 907-243-1473 Email: sahile@gci.net

Page 86

Community Biomass Handbook, but fails however to consider any references with content that rebuts that document of which we cited several in our objection.

Our Objection Point 10 regards health effects of pollutants other than CO2. The American Lung Association's public policy on energy recommends that Federal policies avoid energy production from wood combustion and to instead promote non-combustion renewable energy. The FEIS does not address health issues of wood combustion, air pollution and instead defers to the EPA and ADEC regulatory responsibilities under the Clean Air Act.

The FEIS concludes that there be no significant direct, indirect or cumulative effects on air quality, which is an arbitrary conclusion. Our objection presents substantial documentation demonstrating the contrary.

Our Objection Point 11 shows that the FEIS failed to analyze lost opportunities for zero-emitting renewable energies. Those lost opportunities are caused by subsidies and other favoritism for biomass facilities. Federal investment in biomass facilities is a lost opportunity cost that will divert funds from energy alternatives that can better meet the region's needs.

Page 87

Unmerited diversions of public money to biomass combustion facilities will have a significant negative impact on productive investments since biomass development will be falsely attractive relative to more cost efficient renewable energy technologies.

The Tongass Advisory Committee recommended public subsidies for the biomass industry, including but not limited to utilization research, market development, energy subsidies and tax credits for timber operators and subsidies for biomass facilities. But the FEIS never provides any information about how much the committee's recommendations will cost the public, nor does it analyze how the committee's recommendations will divert public fiscal resources from the development of zero-emitting renewable energy development. This failure is critical.

Also the FEIS arbitrarily failed to disclose the cost of converting Federal buildings in Ketchikan even though that data should be readily available.

In conclusion, for these reasons and the fuller discussions in our objection letter, we ask the Reviewing Officer to direct the Tongass Forest

Page 88

Supervisor to remove biomass from the list of renewable energy sources to be promoted by the Forest Plan.

This addresses your question about criteria. Thank you.

MS. CAULFIELD: Thank you, Larry. So looking next in the list there's five yet to come that also have designated Bob. He's indicating they're covered under your previous remarks and those include -- and this is my understanding, so correct me if you're an objector and if this is not correct, but Hyak Mining, Ketchikan Chamber of Commerce, Ketchikan Gateway Borough, Former Governor Frank Murkowski and Resource Development Council had all indicated that Alaska Power and Telephone would be their designated spokesperson for this issue this afternoon.

(No comments)

MS. CAULFIELD: Okay. So moving beyond those as they're covered under the previous remarks, Southeast Alaska Conservation Council, Buck Lindekugel.

MR. LINDEKUGEL: Thank you, Jan. Interesting topic. I'd like to take a little different approach from others. I'd like to say, Bob, I agree with you, the transportation utility LUD should not be changed wholesale in this Amendment. There's a number of problems with that.

Page 89

Holly and Larry, I agree with you, the biomass is not a renewable energy source. SEACC participated in the Southeast Alaska Integrated Resource Planning Effort and other folks here were involved with that too. One of the focuses of their attention was on energy efficiency and demand controls and there's absolutely no recognition of that emphasis in this planning process and, therefore, that gives an imbalance to the weighing that would go on about moving ahead with renewable energy projects.

I'm noting that conflict and the need to clarify that and perhaps some of this stuff will address the criteria issue as well. Thank you.

MS. CAULFIELD: Thanks, Buck. Okay. State of Alaska, Chris.

MR. MAISCH: Thank you. I'd like to ask Lance Mearig from DOT to address this. He should be online and maybe, Lance, you can introduce yourself, please.

MR. MEARIG: Yes, thank you. This is Lance Mearig with the Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities. I'm the assistant commissioner and the chief engineer and I don't believe that the points that we'd like to raise have been raised already. So I'm going to proceed with



Computer Matrix, LLC Phone: 907-243-0668
135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501 Fax: 907-243-1473 Email: sahile@gci.net

Page 90

our comment.
MS. CAULFIELD: Sounds good, Lance. Thanks.
MR. MEARIG: Okay. Thanks, Jan. State of Alaska agrees with the comments and objections presented by Alaska Power and Telephone and other utilities which have expressed concerns about the development barriers and the lack of predictability that the TUS LUD is removed from the Forest Plan.
The State recommends that the Forest Service preserve the TUS LUD and, in addition, incorporate a springing renewable energy development LUD that will allow power generation facilities and feeder lines to connect to the TUS LUD corridors.
In most areas of the Tongass the TUS LUD lies dormant and is not actively managed. However, when a transportation or utility project is planned for the development in the TUS LUD and has all of its construction and operation permits and authorizations the TUS LUD springs into existence and takes precedence over any contradicting management prescription in each underlying LUD along the entire project.
It is certainty of the springing TUS LUD that ensures the forward momentum for permitting, financing and development of the linear power

Page 91

transmission facilities. Transportation power transmission facilities have a number of development requirements in common, which is why the facilities are almost universally co-located.
Number one, the facilities need to be linear and complete. While there is normally engineering flexibility of where to locate a facility within a corridor, the infrastructure cannot terminate and then restart in order to skip over any certain locations.
Number two, the possible locations for these facilities are greatly restricted by topography and engineering considerations but most all environmental impacts can be avoided or minimized when your facilities can touch sensitive resources that cannot be avoided. Any impacts to sensitive resources are compensated through mitigation measures.
Number three, when fully developed and operating, the facilities are long and skinny and have a very small footprint in relation to the surrounding lands. These facilities cause little disruption to the surrounding ecosystem.
The current TUS LUD takes those common design and operations requirement into account by allowing the authorization for 100 percent of the

Page 92

proposed facility to spring into existence once the facility is ready to construct and operate. Piecemeal authorization will not work for connected infrastructure.
The TUS LUDs are located in developable corridors, not on steep topography or requiring construction of impractical bridges. The TUS LUDS are known by and have an expectation of potential development from U.S. Forest Service staff, State and local governments, the public and the utilities that intend to develop the required transmission lines and maintenance roads.
TUS LUD connects communities of Southeast Alaska to each other and to the continental transportation and utility systems. Renewable energy projects may face unnecessary barriers to permitting and financing if individual projects cannot show that they can be connected to each other and the North American grid.
TUS LUD provides the certainty and predictability for that type of long-range planning and allows the contribution of the National Forest renewable energy assets towards the national climate change goals.
MR. MAISCH: Hey, Lance, Chris here.

Page 93

You've got about a minute. They just flashed the card, so you can't see that.
MR. MEARIG: Okay. Almost there.
MS. CAULFIELD: Thank you for doing my job for me.
MR. MAISCH: No problem.
(Laughter)
MR. MEARIG: The locations of the transportation utility corridors and the TUS LUD are based almost exclusively on the locations of the transportation utility easements established by Congress in SAFETEA-LU Section 4407. Congress granted the easements to the State and the State may authorize public or private utilities to develop power transmission lines within these easements.
I'm reaching the end of my time. I'm just going to conclude. I had some more specifics on the planning rules, but I'll skip over that. In conclusion, the State recommends that the Forest Service preserve the TUS LUD and, in addition, incorporate a springing renewable energy development LUD that will allow power generation facilities and feeder lines to connect to transmission lines in the TUS LUD corridors.
Thank you.



Computer Matrix, LLC Phone: 907-243-0668
135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501 Fax: 907-243-1473 Email: sahile@gci.net

Page 94

MS. CAULFIELD: Thanks very much, Lance. So that actually concludes the objectors and there are two interested persons that I'm aware of both here in the room related to this. Brian, Sealaska Corporation was identified as an interested person. If you have comments you wanted to make and Tony, Ketchikan Indian Community, you also mentioned that earlier. So those are the two remaining.

MR. KLEINHENZ: Thanks. I'll seed my time, but maintain the opportunity to participate in discussion.

MS. CAULFIELD: Of course, yeah. Tony.

MR. GALLEGOS: The Ketchikan Indian Community's leadership, when I discussed this particular area of the Plan, we're kind of split as far as their concerns. A lot of the discussion and comments that have been brought up were discussed, but that balance, which is always hard to find between environmental protection and economic growth and development, were the two main issues that were brought up by the tribal leadership. There was pretty much a split between which is the strongest priority depending upon that. So we didn't commit to one particular direction, but those were our concerns.

MS. CAULFIELD: Okay. Thanks very

Page 95

much, Tony. So we are at a point, Beth, where I think we've concluded with laying the groundwork from objectors and interested parties. Thank you, Dru, for your help with that. We're at a point where we want to enter into discussion. I know, Beth, you indicated that you had some questions you want to use to sort of frame that conversation. So I'll turn it to you.

MS. PENDLETON: Thank you to everybody who shared your concerns and issues. I do have a couple of questions that I'd like to put forward and it would really be helpful for me to hear from each of the objectors. I know, Bob, you've represented quite a few folks, but with these questions it would really be helpful to hear from as many of the objectors that would like to respond to the following question.

So I certainly heard from a number of folks that the Plan direction around renewable energy -- there's some issues with vagueness and subjectivity. So what would be really helpful to me would be to hear -- and I heard a couple of comments from a few folks, but are there some specific additional direction or criteria that you would suggest be included in the Plan that would assist in decision-making for renewable energy projects.

So I think the more specific you can

Page 96

share with me, if there are any specific criteria that you would like to share that could be included in the plan to bring greater clarity around decision-making on renewable energy projects.

MS. CAULFIELD: Buck, go ahead.

MR. LINDEKUGEL: Question. Renewable energy project as defined by the new Plan or what? I mean because that's wide open. That goes into the biomass issues, et cetera.

MS. CAULFIELD: A clarifying question.

MS. PENDLETON: Yeah. So as currently defined in the Plan. I realize that there are some of you that commented that there's an interest in not including, for example, biomass and I clearly did hear that.

MR. CLARK: This is Jim Clark. Just another clarifying question. Can we approach your question in two ways. One you want a clarification of the standards or specific recommendations regarding the standards and guidelines. You've been told by a number of folks that they are too vague and that you need the renewable energy LUD and the TUS LUD to make things work.

Can we answer the question, assuming that the TUS LUD and the renewable energy LUD are in

Page 97

place, as alternative one and alternative two? Answer the specific question you just raised. Can we have a good renewable energy program if we're just relying on standards and guidelines and, if so, what are they. Can we approach it that way?

MS. PENDLETON: Thank you for that, Jim. Yes, and that would be helpful. So assuming that the standards and guides are in place, are there some criteria that could be identified that would make it more clear relative to future decision-making around renewable energy projects?

MR. CLARK: And the second question, will that suffice or do we need the renewable energy TUS LUD as key components of the Plan connected to whatever standards and guidelines would be necessary to implement those LUD? I mean I think both questions would be helpful if you would agree to hear responses on both of those, not just the existing standards and guidelines.

MS. PENDLETON: Yeah, that would be fine. Thank you, Jim.

MS. CAULFIELD: So to sort of reframe that, what I'm hearing is two questions that Beth would like considered are -- and these are all related to criteria that would be in the Plan that would provide



Computer Matrix, LLC Phone: 907-243-0668
135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501 Fax: 907-243-1473 Email: sahile@gci.net

Page 98

more structure perhaps and to how the Forest Service would approach decisions about renewable energy projects. One way to look at that is what would those criteria be if you do not have the TUS overlay or another type of renewable energy LUD. The second way would be to say is that sufficient or is there something about the LUD that the criteria would not be sufficient. There's something about the LUD that would make it work better that you want to advocate for.

And then I guess the thing I was thinking about with regard to biomass is if you want to participate in this conversation about criteria, I think you can do that by saying very clearly, as several of you have said, you don't see biomass being on that list. For things that you would like to see stay on that list here are criteria that you might suggest.

I don't know if that would work for you, but the question on whether biomass is on the list or not perhaps Beth wants to take up later, but in the meantime I think would be things that you would still see staying on that list, do you have criteria to recommend for those projects. You can also tell me I'm all washed up. I'm just trying to see a way to parcel out the question about biomass and still be able to

Page 99

participate in this first conversation about criteria.

MS. PENDLETON: I think what would be helpful to me would be to hear first maybe with the standards and guides as indicated in the current plan. Are there some aspects that would help to provide some greater clarity as it relates to criteria in assisting decision-making for renewable energy projects.

So if we could start maybe first with the scenario that Jan outlined based on current standards and guides. There's some things in there that could.....

MS. CAULFIELD: What's missing.

MS. PENDLETON: Yeah, what's missing. Bob.

MR. GRIMM: I don't want to monopolize this, but the problem I see with the standards and guidelines is that what happens now is because the renewable energy resources haven't been addressed or inventoried, inadvertent planning decisions that occur, this area here is remote recreation.

What if that was an ideal site for a wind installation? Because you didn't take the wind installation into account when you made that decision about making this area remote recreation, you've now, instead of promoting renewable energy you've prohibited

Page 100

it.

So I see a real problem with working with the standards and guidelines in that it's going to be a whole lot of work to inventory everything, get it on the maps so that you can see where it is and not make inadvertent or errors in judgment because you don't see it. It's there now and you can see, well, we've got to provide for this if that's what the Plan guidance is.

Maybe the standards and guidelines would work if you had everything inventoried. But our experience is even with the documents that inventory hydro, I would say that there's about 20 percent of projects that haven't been identified. So if you did inventory and then utilized standards and guidelines, you're still going to have some that aren't inventoried.

Now let's talk about solar. There's no inventory for solar, it's kind of portable, it can be moved around. So that's kind of a different one. It might be smaller in application up here in Southeast Alaska, but we have one facility that's 28 miles south of the Arctic Circle and it puts out as much energy over the entire year 73 percent of the energy that a solar array would make in Tampa.

Page 101

So even though we're in Alaska you can't dismiss solar energy, which is very portable. So you've got one you can't really inventory to take into account and then manage with standards and guidelines.

Windpower. We have very good maps, high-density wind maps, that have been prepared by the Alaska Energy Authority, but they aren't very defining. It's kind of like if you look at most of the coastline in Alaska, which Alaska has the largest amount of Class 7 wind in the United States, it's located here in Alaska, and there's a map that shows that, but it's kind of a broad brush because people are looking at other attributes as well as the wind.

They're looking for transportation, they're looking for access to transmission lines, being in the vicinity of a community. There's a number of factors that the developer will be looking at. So even if you put a big, broad thing and said this is a Class 7 wind and all windpower will be located in this band and we will make sure that we don't do something to prohibit or interpret something to prohibit wind in this big band, I don't think it's good policy.

Tidal. Tidal is a new technology and it's coming on strong. We have a lot of tidal in Southeast Alaska. Again, how do we identify those



Computer Matrix, LLC Phone: 907-243-0668
135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501 Fax: 907-243-1473 Email: sahile@gci.net

Page 102

sites. There's been quite a bit of work. You know, you could do a fair job of identifying them. Would you get them all? No. Would those you didn't identify then become prohibited? That doesn't seem like -- you know, it just seems like a lot of work.

So the long and short of it is as I concluded that if we could kind of use an overlay with controls -- you know, I'm not saying an uncontrolled overlay for renewable energy -- we get away from all that work. If we get away from saying who can develop energy, where the energy can go, what's the highest priority, those are all things that other agencies do. I try not to do it. The market will decide. But what I do know is the renewable energy in Alaska is a very valuable asset. A billion dollars of asset to the National Forest.

We need to figure out some way to manage it where all those controls are in, yet the developer knows that if he goes down the path, there there's a permitting path to success.

MS. PENDLETON: Thank you, Bob.

MR. CLARK: This is Jim Clark. Can I add a point in support of what Bob said?

MS. PENDLETON: Jim, if you could specifically address the need for strengthening

Page 103

criteria within the existing set of standards and guides that are currently indicated in the Plan, that would assist in the decision-making for renewable energy projects. If you can continue that train of thought on that first question, that would be really helpful at this point.

MR. CLARK: I wanted to continue the train of thought that Bob just gave you. I have one minor point to make in that regard. As I've said in the remarks that I've submitted, I don't think the standards and guidelines can be made to work. You need to first put in the renewable energy LUD and put back the TUS LUD before you can -- you need those in place to develop the standards and guidelines once those were in place.

Just one point that supports what Bob said. Before the Roadless Rule was enacted in January of 2001, Congress passed Public Law 106511, Title VI, which required that money be appropriated to consider the intertie that's set out in Southeast Conference Report 97-01, which was done in 1998. Neither the law nor the Southeast Conference Report, which is an inventory such as it existed at that time, are mentioned in either the FEIS or the ROD.

So Bob's point about not having an

Page 104

inventory is spot on and some of the inventory you would have was known but not considered as you did the FEIS and the ROD. So the thing that putting in the renewable energy LUD and the TUS LUD would allow you to do is consider sites which are uninventoried now when folks propose to develop them.

Thank you.

MS. PENDLETON: Thank you, Jim. Any other thoughts from folks with regard to the current standards and guides and helping to bring some greater level of specificity around criteria related to renewable energy development?

MR. MEARIG: This is Lance Mearig.

MS. PENDLETON: Go ahead, Lance.

MR. MEARIG: Is there a chance that our counsel can jump in and make a quick statement? I can try and struggle through this, but he could make it a lot more clearer and concise.

MR. LYNCH: This is Sean Lynch with the State of Alaska. Beth, it was unclear to me this morning when I heard the instructions if the presenter and then discussions if you wanted them to be the same people or if you just didn't want multiple people in the presentation. But if you don't mind a statement from a different person from the State, I think I could

Page 105

try to sum this up in like one minute and try to answer the original question.

MS. PENDLETON: I'm going to allow you to go ahead and do that. Can you please also state your name.

MR. LYNCH: Sure. Sean Lynch with the State of Alaska. So the original question, is there any additional criteria that would make this more clear or if there's just another way to attack it. The deficit that the State saw and continues to see with addressing transportation utility systems or linear systems with the criteria they go into each of the planning areas is that when you look at the map of the Tongass you have a patchwork of different areas and a number of different criteria.

So when we're trying to develop a linear system under new criteria, whether it's the criteria now or additional criteria, each time we cross a new management area it's a separate analysis for that management area. So we would have facilities potentially, and I think in reality, we would have to jog right, jog left, jog north, jog south. The one thing about transportation and utility facilities they are straight.

Where under the current system, and



Computer Matrix, LLC Phone: 907-243-0668
135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501 Fax: 907-243-1473 Email: sahile@gci.net

Page 106

this is why I don't think the components work, but the real advantage of the TUS LUD is for one, since 1997 when they were put into the planning maps, everyone knows where they're at. So there's some expectation that in the future there may be these connecting infrastructure in these corridors.

In the project, whatever it happens to be, long range transmission lines or other, transportation and utility projects, are completely permitted, it's at that time they come into existence. The TUS LUD springs. You get an entire approval for your straight line for your utility facility or maybe not straight, but your linear facility.

So that's the advantage of the TUS LUD and really when you take that away, the variability really that they could be located anywhere, I don't think that's an advantage to anyone. I think that for State and local governments or communities for energy development it's much more predictable and knowable knowing the approximate location of these linear facilities and that once they're completely permitted the last step is for the LUD to spring and allow it in the Forest Plan.

Thank you.

MS. PENDLETON: Thanks, Sean. Is there

Page 107

anybody else who would like to address the question. Larry.

MR. EDWARDS: Larry Edwards. I think we're getting to an area here that's extremely dangerous. It's getting one step closer to one-stop shopping. I think it's fine to have utility and renewable energy corridors marked on a map, but to have the fate of those kind of projects preordained I think is very dangerous.

It gets us into the kind of situation that we did with -- I can't remember the name of the public law, but it's a SAFETEA-LU bill where basically certain corridors are preordained by Congress because they were on a map in an earlier Forest Plan. It avoids certain processes such as NEPA, for example, or others where that should be looked at in terms of what's reasonable in terms of land management planning that's under the Forest Service's purview.

So I think that we need to avoid situations where these kind of projects have a trump. It's fine to look at them and run through the process, but it's a process that needs to be gone through.

MS. PENDLETON: Thanks, Larry.

MS. CAULFIELD: Carol, I was going to check with you on the phone since you had a brief

Page 108

comment in your opening remarks related to criteria and that's what Beth is asking about now. Was there anything else you wanted to add to what you said earlier or elaborate upon that at all? Perhaps in the conversation that Beth has organized now, which is a question about your thoughts on criteria. If there is not going to be a LUD, that was the first question. Secondly, others are addressing still their interest in having a LUD.

So I just wanted to invite you back in, Carol, if there was additional comments you wanted to make on this.

MS. RUSHMORE: Not really because I don't have good enough technical expertise in this. To the City the focus is that the high priority be given to the social and economic criteria such that -- whether it be through a LUD or be through the way the Plan is now outlining it -- that the benefits of the communities and the residents of Southeast Alaska be a top priority in evaluating these potential projects in places where you may not know where they're located now, but they may turn up as the future develops new processes and procedures.

I just think it's critical that the language is spelled out very clearly that the social

Page 109

and economic benefits to residents and the communities is a top priority. I don't think it says that right now.

MS. PENDLETON: Thank you, Carol. If there aren't any other comments with regard to the specific criteria within the standards and guides or relative to reinstatement of a TUS LUD for example, I do have another question for follow up. So let me just pause here and make sure that there isn't any other input on this.

(No comments)

MS. PENDLETON: Okay. So let me just see if there were to be a reinstatement of a TUS LUD, then what specific criteria would be beneficial to be included in the Plan that would assist in decision-making relative to renewable energy projects.

MR. GRIMM: The existing TUS probably needs to be modified rather than just reinstating it. There is some language in there that pits public against private enterprise. That should be eliminated.

Perhaps trying to look out into the future to make sure things like terrestrial things like fiber optics are covered in a TUS so it all of a sudden just doesn't get left out. That could be good. I think the only renewable resource mentioned is hydro



Computer Matrix, LLC Phone: 907-243-0668
135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501 Fax: 907-243-1473 Email: sahile@gci.net

Page 110

and perhaps a more generic term of renewable resource without biomass would be better.

So I wouldn't just reinstate what's in there now. It does have some tricky language when you use the TUS in a TUS avoidance area where it causes the Forest Service to make a determination that there's no feasible alternative. That's a very difficult decision for the Forest Service to be trying to create.

So those are kind of the concerns that we have on the existing TUS. As far as reinstating it, yes, we think it's a valuable planning tool and it needs to be reinstated.

MR. CLARK: Beth, this is Jim Clark. Can I just add a point to what Bob said.

MS. PENDLETON: That would be fine, Jim. Go ahead. Thank you, Bob.

MR. CLARK: There is a letter from Forrest Cole to Bob dated July 2009 that explains a defect in the existing TUS, that I would urge be cleaned up, that Forrest said would be fixed in the next -- when there was a Forest Plan Amendment and this would seem the perfect time to -- you know, it's better described by Forrest than me. It is in that letter. If it would be easy, I could email that letter to you and you could take a look at it. It does describe what

Page 111

needs to be done, among other things, to clean up the TUS LUD.

MS. PENDLETON: Thanks, Jim. We'll be checking with folks, but I suspect we have that in the record and we'll let you know.

MR. CLARK: Well, it's not mentioned in the FEIS or the ROD, so perhaps it would be something you'd want to take a look at.

MS. PENDLETON: Thank you. So let me just ask that question again before -- because I've got at least one other question I want to visit with folks on. Again, with a TUS LUD, would there be specific criteria that you would want to bring forward that would suggest be included in the Plan that would assist in decision-making around renewable energy projects?

MR. LYNCH: This is Sean Lynch with State of Alaska.

MS. CAULFIELD: Sean, go ahead and then we're going to go to Buck Lindekugel.

SEAN LYNCH: Oh, okay. Sorry, Buck. I didn't see you there.

(Laughter)

MR. LYNCH: In the State's comments we had made the suggestion of the preservation of the TUS LUD, but, in addition, because we do recognize that

Page 112

for the facility itself or for the feeder lines that come from the facility, whatever the renewable energy facility, whether it be tidal power, hydro power, to the TUS LUD, there would still have to be -- I think we recommended there the renewable energy components that were offered in the amendment -- I think actually just from seeing it in action with the TUS LUD that a renewable energy LUD would probably be more predictable and effective, but the reinstatement of the TUS LUD doesn't solve all the problems. We still have the problem of getting the facility -- locating a facility on the feeder line.

So when you're asking which components, I think at a minimum it would be the renewable energy components as proposed, but I guess our recommendation would go one step further and make it a renewable energy LUD.

MS. PENDLETON: Thanks, Sean.

MR. LINDEKUGEL: Thank you. I don't want to get too far into the weeds because it's tough -- the moving ball phenomena of knowing how to respond to some of this stuff, but I wanted to repeat an earlier statement about ensuring that energy efficiency and demand site management measures are incorporated into the balancing that the Agency undertakes.

Page 113

And then I know it's come up as a concern to some of our members about addressing local needs first versus using National Forest resources for export. Whether that's logs or hydro energy, it's a concern, particularly the destination for those resources. It's unclear whether it's good for local communities for energy to be exported to Canada and potentially be used to develop transboundary mines that would have potential deleterious effects on Southeast communities.

Thank you.

MS. PENDLETON: Thanks, Buck. So you kind of got into my next question a little bit, but that's good. I'm going to go ahead and move on, but if somebody has something burning that they'd like to share relative to the current standards and guides and clarity and criteria or considering a TUS LUD, if there are some specific criteria that would make more clear and assist in decision-making around future renewable energy projects, I'm open to hearing that.

I did want to ask the question should renewable energy projects that do not produce power intended for use by Southeast Alaska communities should they be a lower priority for permit consideration than projects that do provide energy to local communities.



Computer Matrix, LLC Phone: 907-243-0668
135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501 Fax: 907-243-1473 Email: sahile@gci.net

Page 114

So I would appreciate hearing perspective on that as well. This is an issue that came up in a number of the objections on both sides of the issue and it would be helpful to kind of hear some perspectives on that.

MR. CLARK: This is Jim Clark. The last issue you said you'd still entertain and then I'll get out of the way so people can talk about what you just asked. But I think when you ask can we put criteria and then the LUDs, I think you've got it backwards. I think that you need to decide to have a TUS LUD and a renewable energy LUD and then decide what the standards and guidelines would be for implementing those two.

Thank you.

MS. PENDLETON: Thank you, Jim.

MR. CAULFIELD: Buck, were you just coming in on the next point? I mean I know you segued to that, but I thought I saw you reaching for your button. I'm just seeing if you -- Beth's question about local benefit versus export.

MR. LINDEKUGEL: I think definitely from our members the emphasis should be on local reliable energy sources. Particularly using our local resources for those benefits. I could repeat that

Page 115

again, but I don't know if it would be any clearer. I hope that helps.

MS. CAULFIELD: Thanks. Yeah.

MR. EDWARDS: I'd like to second that.

MR. CAULFIELD: So Larry, thank you.

MR. GRIMM: And I would agree, but I think one thing that we're missing here is that renewable resources on this National Forest are a national asset and their ability to displace energy that's now being produced by fossil fuel is a very valuable environmental attribute.

So while I operate and believe in the local communities of Southeast Alaska, I think that global aspect also needs to be at least elaborated on. So the way it read now it looks like well we really don't want export, but somebody commented on it, so we put it at the bottom of the list.

I would prefer that it be presented kind of on an equal basis and there should be other criteria that once you got into the project level review you would be looking at and saying, well, this project might not provide power to -- the power that it provides to a resident in Southeast Alaska is very small compared to what it is exporting, but get into the benefits that would be -- the non-export -- you

Page 116

know, the exported power of the project itself, its taxes, the supply chain, the jobs it's creating, would be benefitting the local community or the vicinity where it was located. So I think it kind of gets covered that way.

I don't like export being the last in line if it's just there for eyewash, but I think it's an important aspect that that asset be utilized in a global way for the sake of the environment, of earth.

MR. EDWARDS: Larry. I think that we should maybe start looking at the region's isolation as one of its natural resources.

MS. PENDLETON: Any other thoughts or comments on that question, should renewable energy projects that do not produce power intended for use by Southeast Alaska communities be a lower priority for permit consideration than projects that do provide energy for local communities. Anything else on that that folks want to share?

MR. GRIMM: You might be able to get some guidance on that from the U.S. Forest Service itself in the strategic energy framework. This isn't just a document. This is signed by Thomas L. Tidwell, so it would provide guidance I think along that line.

MS. PENDLETON: Thanks, Bob.

Page 117

MR. MACKINNON: This is Neil MacKinnon in Juneau.

MS. PENDLETON: Yes, Neil.

MR. MACKINNON: My thought on export is let's turn around and say what if we could only produce the fish we could consume here locally. We couldn't export any fish, especially to some country that we don't happen to like at the moment. It's no different from that from power in essence. It's production of a resource.

So Larry Edwards or somebody who is worried about going to mines in Canada, well it's going to go there anyway, but this power is going to be fed through Canada to the U.S. Now is that exporting the power or are we just using them as an extension cord.

Anyway, you think about it in one isolated thing, but look at it from all commodities.

MS. PENDLETON: Thanks, Neil. We're going to take a 10-minute break and then reconvene back at quarter till 3:00.

MS. CAULFIELD: For those of you who are on the phone, we're just going to keep the phone line open. If it's easiest for you just to hang on the phone, then that's great too. I'm going to put it on mute, but the phone line will be open. We'll be back



Computer Matrix, LLC Phone: 907-243-0668
135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501 Fax: 907-243-1473 Email: sahile@gci.net

Page 118

at quarter to 3:00 and we'll talk to you then.
(Off record)
(On record)
MS. CAULFIELD: Okay. Welcome back everybody. Again, this is Jan Caulfield, facilitator for the meeting this afternoon here in Ketchikan. We had one new person who has been involved in this process and has objector status on several other issues who's joined us. Austin, I just wanted to give you a chance to say hello and introduce yourself. It's a simple push in on the button when you talk.
MR. WILLIAMS: Hi, everybody. I'm Austin Williams with Trout Unlimited. I was a little delayed getting down from Anchorage this morning. Afternoon now.
MS. CAULFIELD: Okay, great. Thanks for joining us, Austin. Beth, I'll turn it back to you for pursuing different lines of discussion.
MS. PENDLETON: Okay, great. Thank you, Jan. Welcome, Austin. So what I'd like to do is I want to share a couple of thoughts with you all and then I think I've got one kind of final question that I would like folks to ponder on.
In the current plan, the selected alternative removes the TUS overlay and LUD and

Page 119

includes some new management direction that is intended to alleviate Plan-related impediments to renewable energy production. We received in the scoping a number of comments and questions that the previous TUS LUD management prescription was complicated and didn't provide the clarity that folks had.
So the new direction provides for a priority consideration of renewable energy projects. In the selected alternative, all LUDs allow for renewable energy development. So energy development has a priority and the applicable standards and guides were crafted to help provide that greater clarity.
So what would be helpful for me to hear from each of you would be what do you perceive as the constraints with the proposed Plan direction. What do you see as constraints.
Holly.
MS. HARRIS: I'm afraid I have to answer that in the opposite. When we reviewed the planning record, we were unable to find any projects that identified challenges or specific inadequacies in the existing Plan that prohibited or otherwise restricted these projects.
So I think it would be really useful if the Agency could say this project ran into trouble

Page 120

because of these provisions and that's what we're trying to fix. What we heard were sort of generic concerns of it's hard to do. Well, hard to do is hard to fix. So I think if we could have a little greater clarity and specificity on what problem you see that these projects are confronting, what provisions in the 2008 Amended Forest Plan were proving problematic, we'd have a better understanding on what we need to fix.
So I guess I just would encourage the Agency to bolster the record in terms of what problems did these projects run into rather than we're hearing at a 60,000-foot level this is hard. We just didn't see that in the planning record. If it's in there, I guess I'd ask that it be emphasized and that would help us better understand what problem you're trying to solve.
MS. PENDLETON: Thank you, Holly. Others.
MR. GRIMM: Beth, if I may.....
MR. CLARK: I'll just answer the previous speaker's question. The July 2009 letter from Forrest Cole to Bob Grimm dealt specifically with the inability -- was an admission by the Forest Service about the inability to implement the TUS LUD in connection with the Soule River Project. That's just a

Page 121

specific. Holly is right. That letter is not mentioned in the planning record, which is why no one saw it. So that's just one example.
Thank you.
MS. PENDLETON: Thank you. I believe that was Jim Clark speaking.
MR. GRIMM: Beth, I'm a little bit confused. As we read the proposed standard and guidelines -- as I stated earlier, the standards and guidelines state the Chapter 5 plan component, renewable energy, takes precedent over Chapter 3 and 4, management direction, which is consistent with what you just said. However it goes on. It indicates that Chapter 3 and 4 take precedence via the consideration LUD.
So we kind of go around in a circle and that's one of the problems that we have with the current wording, is that it's really not clear. If that was your intent, I would encourage you to clarify it, but that's not what we're reading.
MS. PENDLETON: Thank you, Bob. Buck.
MR. LINDEKUGEL: Thank you. And it was also unclear from our review whether or not -- if you're including biomass as a renewable energy, does that mean that biomass production is an allowable use



Computer Matrix, LLC Phone: 907-243-0668
135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501 Fax: 907-243-1473 Email: sahile@gci.net

Page 122

of all LUDs regardless of that LUD's desired future condition, et cetera?

Thanks.

MS. PENDLETON: Thanks, Buck.

MR. EDWARDS: This is Larry. This is beyond my expertise in terms of what's in the objection, but the point that Bob just raised, I do have some notes here. I would ask you to look at our objection on Page 104, footnote 31. We discuss that same point as well.

MS. PENDLETON: Thanks, Larry. I'll go ahead and repeat my question and see if there's any last thoughts on that. In the Forest Plan, all land use designations allow for energy development. Energy development has a priority. So, given that, what do you perceive as the constraints with the proposed plan direction?

MR. GRIMM: Again, it's a circular reference here, if that's addressing your question. It says it takes precedence in 3 and 4, yet you turn around and say Chapters 3 and 4 take precedence over renewable energy and via the consideration of a LUD.

MS. PENDLETON: Any other comments.

MR. CLARK: This is Jim Clark with just one final point that would be worth looking at.

Page 123

Doesn't Title XI of ANILCA require a TUS as part of the plan?

MS. PENDLETON: Thanks, Jim, for that comment. I don't have any further questions.

MR. MAISCH: Beth, if I could go back to one of your earlier questions.

MS. PENDLETON: Sure, Chris.

MR. MAISCH: That was your first question where you were talking about a plan direction. You had mentioned vagueness and subjectivity. One of the things I think would be useful with helping and several others have commented about inventory of renewable energy. There is a really good document that was produced by Alaska Energy Authority. It's the Renewable Energy Atlas and it has a lot of good specificity about renewable energy projects around the state, but especially also in Southeast. So I think it would be good to somehow incorporate that information if it's not there and I don't believe it is at the moment.

Thank you.

MS. CAULFIELD: Thanks, Chris.

MS. PENDLETON: Thanks, Chris.

(Pause)

MS. PENDLETON: So thanks, folks, for

Page 124

your sharing around this first focus topic for the objections around renewable energy. I'm going to share a couple of thoughts with folks before we break for the day.

First of all I want to just say that I appreciate the comments that have been made. I've certainly heard interest on behalf of some of consideration given to -- I won't use the word reinstatement, but reconsideration of the use of the TUS LUD and overlay. I also heard from some the importance of giving consideration also to a spring or sort of a feeder overlay too that would consider connected projects.

From others I have heard some interest in giving more I think specificity within the existing standard and guides relative to more specific criteria as well as some suggestions that I might look at to provide that greater clarity around criteria that would give clearer direction relative to decision-making and siting of renewable energy projects on the Tongass. So I think it's been very helpful to hear those thoughts and those remarks from folks.

Thank you for answering some of the questions and giving some further thought and discussion to the questions that I pose. I think

Page 125

that's going to help me as I move forward and give consideration and direction to the Forest Supervisor relative to the Record of Decision.

And I think that's it. That will help -- the remarks and comments that have been shared I think will help in providing that direction. That's it, Jan.

MS. CAULFIELD: Okay. Beth, thanks. So we will reconvene tomorrow morning. Actually, let me start with it's 3:00 and if we were taking additional topics, if there's things you'd like to suggest for the agendas for Day 3 and Day 6, those are due by 5:00, so a couple hours more to either email them in or hand them to us on a piece of paper if you're here in Ketchikan. By 5:00 today any of those topics please submit them. We're going to work on those agendas tonight. So thank you for that.

Tomorrow morning we'll here in Ketchikan of course be right back here. We are starting at 9:00 tomorrow morning and it will be 9:00 to noon and then about 1:15 to 5:00 with two topics. The topic for the morning will be issue 2, young-growth inventory, and the topic for the afternoon, issue 3, the timeframe for transition to young growth. So that's what we're doing tomorrow.



Computer Matrix, LLC Phone: 907-243-0668
135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501 Fax: 907-243-1473 Email: sahile@gci.net

Page 126

Any questions before we break that will help with participation tomorrow from either those in the room or on the phone. Questions or comments.

Owen, go ahead.

MR. GRAHAM: I just had a question, Beth. How significant a change can you make in the ROD at this point?

MS. PENDLETON: There's a fair amount of flexibility and I think that's why we're trying to delve into some of these issues to see where there's opportunity either for greater clarity or need for change in the Final Record of Decision. So there is a fair amount of flexibility, Owen.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you.

MS. PENDLETON: I also want to acknowledge that, you know, as I shared earlier today that this is a new process, the objection process, and it's also an opportunity I think to learn. As we move forward in the next couple days, hopefully to strengthen the dialogue, the questions that I have asked have been ones that I have pondering and thinking about so as to bring that greater clarity in the ROD in the direction to the Forest Supervisor as he prepares that Final Record of Decision.

If there's things that need to be

Page 127

addressed, that will be stated in my resolution letter to all objectors, but also as direction to the Forest Supervisor to provide that clarity and need.

So I appreciate the input and the comment from each of you and your attendance and sharing not only what you're provided in your written objections, but in the conversation and dialogue that we had today and your sharing.

The objection process is an opportunity to increase my understanding around the issues and possible resolution, but also to exercise that ability to inquire. I believe that inquiry is a key way to help better understand and find a possible remedy and solution moving forward.

So I look forward -- we've got a number of other topics. We're going to be looking at some of the other issues that have come forward yet this afternoon with the team here to outline the agenda for Friday and for next Wednesday. So I look forward to the continued dialogue and topics that we've already identified for further discussion and look forward to seeing you all in the morning.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you.

MS. CAULFIELD: Thanks to those on the phone and I will reconnect with you in the morning

Page 128

starting at 9:00, so we'll be on the phone about 10 minutes to 9:00. Thanks a lot.

(Off record)

(PROCEEDINGS TO BE CONTINUED)

C E R T I F I C A T E

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA )
)ss.
STATE OF ALASKA )

I, Salena A. Hile, Notary Public in and for the state of Alaska and reporter for Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC, do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 02 through 129 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the TONGASS NATIONAL FOREST PLAN AMENDMENT OBJECTION RESOLUTION MEETING, VOLUME I, taken electronically on the 12th day of October at Ketchikan, Alaska;

THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed by under my direction and reduced to print to the best of our knowledge and ability;

THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or party interested in any way in this action.

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 28th day of October 2016.

_____
Salena A. Hile
Notary Public, State of Alaska
My Commission Expires: 09/16/18



Computer Matrix, LLC Phone: 907-243-0668
135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501 Fax: 907-243-1473 Email: sahile@gci.net