

STATE OF ALASKA

DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

DIVISION OF SPORT FISH

SEAN PARNELL, GOVERNOR

Research and Technical Services
333 Raspberry Road
Anchorage, Alaska 99518-1565
PHONE: (907) 267-2312
FAX: (907) 267-2364

May 12, 2011

Ms. Kimberly Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street
Washington D.C. 20426

**Ref.: “NOTICE OF PRELIMINARY PERMIT APPLICATION ACCEPTED FOR
FILING AND SOLICITING COMMENTS, MOTIONS TO INTERVENE, AND
COMPETING APPLICATIONS” Project No. 12495-002
ADF&G Comments on Cascade Creek LLC application for a third Preliminary Permit.**

Dear Ms. Bose:

Attached are the Alaska Department of Fish and Game comments on the Cascade Creek LLC application for a third Preliminary Permit (PP) for Project, FERC No. 12495-002. The use of italics identifies applicant statements in the PP application or information from other sources, as identified.

On February 1, 2011, Cascade Creek, LLC filed an application, with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC), for a third Preliminary Permit pursuant to section 4(f) of the Federal Power Act (FPA), proposing to study the feasibility of the Cascade Creek Hydroelectric Project (Cascade Creek project) to be located on Cascade Creek, Swan Lake, and Falls Lake in the vicinity of Petersburg, Alaska.

On March 15, 2011, FERC posted a “NOTICE OF PRELIMINARY PERMIT APPLICATION ACCEPTED FOR FILING AND SOLICITING COMMENTS, MOTIONS TO INTERVENE, AND COMPETING APPLICATIONS” on the FERC website. A sixty (60) day time period was identified for filing of Comments, Motions to Intervene and Competing Applications.

GENERAL STATEMENT OF THE ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF FISH & GAME

The Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G), is the state of Alaska’s principal manager of fish and wildlife resources and their habitat. The ADF&G is mandated under state law to: “...manage, protect, maintain, improve, and extend the fish, game, and aquatic plant resources of the state in the interest of the economy and general well-being of the state...” (AS 16.05.020). Among the ADF&G’s various powers and duties are: “...to assist the United States Fish and Wildlife Service in the enforcement of federal laws and regulations pertaining to fish and game...” (AS 16.05.050), and protect fish habitat (AS 16.05.841 and AS 16.05.871).

Managing Alaska’s fish and wildlife resources and protecting the habitat that sustains them are integral to the health of the state’s economy. Collectively in 2009, commercial, sport, and subsistence fisheries generated over 1.4 billion dollars to the state’s economy. Following the oil and gas industry, mining, tourism and the government sector, these fisheries represent a major source of income to the state’s economy.

The applicant has been awarded two previous PP’s (three years each) totaling six (6) years and now seeks a third PP. The applicant did not file a license application during the previous six year term of the first and second PP’s.

The proposed project is located in the Cascade Creek watershed which flows into Thomas Bay near Petersburg, Alaska. Water is proposed to be siphoned from Swan Lake, greatly reducing flows to Cascade Creek. Water will travel down a penstock and through a powerhouse, which will be located near tidewater, and will be released through a tailrace into Thomas Bay.

The proposed project will consist of the following: (1) a low-head weir on Swan Lake with a 3-foot-high, 50-foot-long crest gate and an intake siphon; (2) a 16,000-foot-long, 12 to 14-foot diameter unlined power conduit; (3) an 780-foot-long, 9-foot-diameter steel penstock from the power conduit to the powerhouse; (4) a 140-foot by 80-foot concrete and metal powerhouse containing three turbines with a capacity of 70 megawatts (MW); (5) an approximately 18.7-mile-long, 138-kV transmission line which will tie into an undetermined interconnection near Petersburg; and (6) appurtenant facilities. The estimated annual generation of the Cascade Creek project would be 205 gigawatt-hours. The project also lists a tailrace measuring 450 feet by 40 feet that runs from the powerhouse to tidewater in Thomas Bay.

Projects that have the potential to impact fish passage may require a Title 16 permit. The Cascade Creek watershed provides habitat supporting rainbow trout and Dolly Varden char. Fish collection reports filed with ADF&G for collection efforts on Cascade Creek during 2010 also document capture of a coho smolt. The proposed project could affect upstream and downstream fish passage, spawning, incubation, and rearing habitat. Protection, improvement, and maintenance of fish habitat and production in these systems are essential to fishery production in the Cascade Creek watershed.

GENERAL COMMENTS

Cascade Creel LLC has shown minimal due diligence on the previous two PP's. Little was accomplished toward environmental studies during the first five and one half years. Extensive consultation effort was expended by ADF&G personnel to identify necessary baseline studies in both aquatic resources and wildlife resources. The applicant chose to create their own studies late in the process and generally to ignore the baseline information needs identified by ADF&G and others. The studies presented are far from what was identified and the results presented will be of limited use in evaluation of this project. Many studies identified during consultation were not included as studies listed in the PP application document. This includes wildlife studies of large animals including moose and mountain goat. The listed studies in the application will not answer baseline questions identified during consultation with the agencies.

There are no references to any incorporation of SD-1 or SD-2 comments in this application, including many issues involving the CP. The applicant has not acknowledged any of the comments filed by the agencies.

The applicant failed to conduct studies as agreed upon during the September 28, 2010 agency meeting held in Petersburg. Instead, the studies were delayed and the window of seasonality may have been missed. Preliminary study plans for field studies for 2011 were submitted by the applicant on April 1, 2011. We recently received study reports from 2010 and need to complete our review before we can evaluate the 2011 study plans. The applicant risks expense for field work which may not answer agency needs to evaluate this project.

This applicant has made numerous promises to provide information. The information provided lacked quality and was delayed many times. Public meetings have been promised but not scheduled. These were all concerns previously expressed to FERC.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Page 2,

INITIAL STATEMENT

The applicant describes the work accomplished during the first previous PP as “*substantial*”, and work accomplished during the second PP as “*significant and substantial*.” The applicant cites “*obtaining data and performing acts*” in statements about both previous PP periods. In fact, little data was collected under either PP. Field studies were initiated during the summer of 2010 and did not follow guidance provided through agency consultations. Study plans were written after studies were conducted and neither study reports nor study plans were provided to the agencies until very late in the term of the second PP or after the PP had expired.

The applicant states “*The Applicant is submitting this application for a preliminary permit in order to maintain priority of application while completing the remaining work required to finalize and submit a development application for a FERC license.*”

While we are still evaluating 2010 study plans and reports, generally we are finding that the studies submitted are deficient, incomplete, and lack a basis in science. The studies do not provide even the baseline information necessary to evaluate a development application. The fisheries studies were rushed, (August to October 2010) do not reflect seasonality, and fail to address ADF&G concerns and issues raised during consultations held over the previous five years.

The applicant states the PP is necessary to “*maintain priority of application while completing the remaining work required to finalize and submit a development application for a FERC license.*”

The applicant filed a Draft License Application (DLA) and Preliminary Draft Environmental Assessment (PDEA) with the commission on February 11, 2011, after the second PP expired. Either this PP is unnecessary since the DLA and PDEA have been submitted, or the DLA and PDEA are deficient and should be dismissed by the commission. This statement by the applicant and the submission of 2011 Aquatic Study Plans to the agencies on April 1, 2011, shows acknowledgement by the applicant that the DLA and PDEA are incomplete.

Page 3,

“(3) *The exact name, business address, and telephone number of the Applicant are:*

Cascade Creek, LLC

3633 Alderwood Avenue

Bellingham, WA 98225

Phone: (360) 738-9999

FAX: (360) 733-3056”

(4) *“Cascade Creek, LLC, is a domestic corporation organized and existing in the State of Alaska, and is not claiming preference under section 7(a) of the Federal Power Act.”*

Referencing (3) and (4) above, Cascade Creek LLC may or may not exist as stated.

From the Canadian Stock Exchange listing for Alaska Hydro (AKH) on May 9, 2011: *“Alaska Hydro Corporation owns and operates Cascade Creek hydroelectric project on Swan Lake in the Thomas Bay area of Alaska. The Cascade Creek project has a design capacity of 70 megawatts and generation potential of 205 gigawatt hours of electricity. The company was formerly known as Cascade Creek LLC and changed its name to Alaska Hydro Corporation in September 2010. The company is based in Juneau, Alaska. Alaska Hydro Corporation operates as a subsidiary of Tollhouse Energy Company.”*

From Top Institutional Holders 12/8/2010: *Alaska Hydro Corporation, formerly Project Finance Corp, is a Canada-based company. Effective September 3, 2010, it completed its previously announced qualifying transaction. The Company acquired all of Cascade Creek, LLC (Cascade). Cascade owns the Cascade Creek Project, a proposed lake-tap hydroelectric project on Swan Lake in the Thomas Bay area of Alaska. The installed plant capacity for the Cascade Creek Project is approximately 70 megawatts. Upon completion of the qualifying transaction, Cascade became a wholly owned subsidiary of the Company.*

From Bloomberg Businessweek, May 9, 2011: *Alaska Hydro Corporation, a development stage company, focuses on the acquisition and development of renewable energy projects. The company primarily focuses on hydropower projects. It owns Cascade Creek project, a 70 megawatts lake syphon hydropower project located in Thomas Bay near Petersburg, Alaska. The company was founded in 2004 and is based in North Vancouver, Canada*

From alacrastore.com, the Thompson Reuters Business Description, on May 9, 2011 : *Alaska Hydro Corporation, formerly Project Finance Corp, is a Canada-based company. Effective September 3, 2010, it completed its previously announced qualifying transaction. The Company acquired all of Cascade Creek, LLC (Cascade). Cascade owns the Cascade Creek Project, a proposed lake-tap hydroelectric project on Swan Lake in the Thomas Bay area of Alaska. The installed plant capacity for the Cascade Creek Project is approximately 70 megawatts. Upon completion of the qualifying transaction, Cascade became a wholly owned subsidiary of the Company.*

The Alaska Hydro Corporation website, www.alaskahydro.com, lists contacts as :

“Vancouver Corporate office

Washington Office

Suite 503 - 675 W. Hastings Street

3633 Alderwood Avenue

Vancouver BC Canada V6B 1N2

Bellingham, WA 98225

Phone: 604.558.1300

Phone: 360.738.9999

Fax: 604.558.1313

Fax: 360.733.3056”

While the primary statement of Cascade creek LLC that it is a domestic corporation is true, Cascade Creek LLC appears to be either owned by a Canadian corporation or a series of Canadian corporations. Throughout the terms of the previous two PP’s the applicant has been selective on what has been placed in the reading file (see ADF&G previous FERC filings on meeting notes from the September 27, 2010 agency meeting and SD-2 comments). Statements on the Alaska Hydro Corporation website about the Cascade Creek project indicate that this is an environmentally sound development and that *“the positive public opinion trend is reinforced...”* The nature of the proposed development has yet to be fully determined by the agencies involved and public opinion has been less than positive. Language used in the Canadian Stock Exchange listing stating that Alaska Hydro Corporation owns and operates Cascade Creek Hydroelectric Project is incorrect. Alaska Hydro Corporation may own a conceptual idea but there is nothing owned or operated in Thomas Bay by either Alaska Hydro Corporation or Cascade Creek LLC. Bloomberg Businessweek also used similar language. This proposed project is, and has been during the previous two PP’s, filled with incorrect information provided to the public, agencies, FERC and apparently prospective investors.

“(6) There are no existing dams, or other existing Project facilities.”

While this statement is technically true, the Alaska Hydro Corporation website continues to describe this project as one of a three project complex in Thomas Bay along with Ruth and Scenery Lakes. The commission was petitioned previously regarding a hidden hybrid and ruled that one did not exist. In a letter dated November 26, 2010 to Secretary Bose of FERC and filed with the commission, Cascade Creek LLC submitted the second six month project report for the

Ruth Lake Hydroelectric Project (Project No. 13366). A second look at this question may be warranted due to ownership references made on Alaska Hydro Corporation's own website.

Page 6

PROJECT FEATURES

The request for a total capacity of 70 megawatts has never been justified. The water available from Swan Lake will not support this kind of generation capacity. If the intent is to bring water from either Ruth or Scenery lake systems the intent needs to be identified. These projects were split apart prior to the previous PP. If the intent is to divert water to this site then there will be significant impacts to the marine environment which have been totally ignored by this applicant during the previous two PP terms.

Dam

The applicant states that no dam is anticipated as part of this proposal. What the applicant describes as a six foot high weir used to artificially hold the level of Swan Lake at the high water mark would seem to be a dam. Previous applicant documents state that the sill below this dam will also be grouted to eliminate accretion, essentially making this a much taller structure. Further, the Alaska Hydro Corporation website identifies this project as a storage project.

Spillway

Several statements in this section need clarification. This application identifies a building at the lake. This is a new addition from previous PP's which had no buildings at Swan Lake. What is the size and where would the building be sited? This building has never included in scoping of this project.

Under the Spillway section the applicant states *"the weir will provide minimum instream flow if required."* *Instream flow requirements will be evaluated and addressed. The applicant states the weir will "facilitate lake level management by adding the ability to store or release water as necessary in drought or flood conditions to help maintain desired lake level."* The Alaska Hydro Corporation website also identifies the project as a storage hydropower facility. There has been

much discussion regarding the type of project that is proposed. What was initially a storage project was changed to a run of river project.

Page 7

Tailrace

The applicant states " *the tailrace would be designed to deter use by anadromous fish.*" The applicant proposes to create 450 feet of tailrace but will deter anadromous fish from finding and trying to use this area. How will that deterrence be accomplished? Under current conditions, there may be few salmon trying to use Cascade Creek below the falls due to limited area. A new tailrace, approximately 18,000 square feet in size, has a greater likelihood to attract salmon and should be designed with appropriate preventative measures.

Dock

The applicant proposes to construct a new marine access facility on Thomas Bay, adjacent to the powerhouse site. A new dock would be approximately 290-ft-long on a fixed pier with a 60-foot long ramp down to a 60 foot by 30 foot float stationed to piling. There have been no marine studies conducted to determine the impact of such a facility on the marine environment. This structure was never included in previous scoping of this project.

Page 8

The applicant intends to make the new dock available to the public after the project begins commercial operation. Has the applicant studied or estimated the impact of increased public access on the Fish, Wildlife, and recreational resources of this area. While necessary for project construction, this dock may not be in the best interest of these resources once the project is complete. There will also be a permanent visual impact to the aesthetics the Cascade Creek/Thomas Bay interface area. Greater availability of access may also increase risk of site vandalism and could prompt requests from operators to post the project footprint with no trespassing allowed signs, thus removing recreational access to the entire watershed. The applicant statement of " *it has the potential to provide the public safe landing access for any*

upland use purposes” is inappropriate without identifying the effects of increased access. Who will accept maintenance responsibilities and liability for this dock?

Other Structures

This proposal now includes the addition of two housing units to remain after construction is complete. Previous PP's have stated that no housing would be left on the site after construction and that no roads would be built. *“Localized transportation from the housing units to the powerhouse site would be by vehicle or by foot.”* Transportation by vehicle implies some form of road development.

Page 9

(2) RESERVOIR

The applicant states *“The Project would utilize the natural impoundment of Swan Lake, a high alpine, glacially-fed water body with a surface area of approximately 579 acres and an approximate usable stored capacity of 3,474 acre-ft (af), assuming a 6-ft operational drawdown. The water surface elevation of Swan Lake naturally fluctuates within an approximate maximum 8-ft range, and an annual natural fluctuation within an average 6-ft range. Applicant does not propose to impound Swan Lake above its natural ordinary high water elevation and will not operate outside the standard, natural drawdown of the lake.”*

The applicant states that operations will target lake levels within the natural eight feet of fluctuation, which they have identified, and will not be conducted outside the standard, natural drawdown of the lake. If the lake level falls below the bottom of the spillway, which at the lowest is three feet above the current lake sill elevation, how will any water get into Cascade Creek? If the sill is pumped full of grout to stop or reduce accretion flows into Cascade Creek, flows from Swan Lake could be eliminated.

(3) TRANSMISSION LINE

“ A 138-kV transmission line would extend underground approximately 560-ft from the powerhouse substation to tide water near the marine access facility, then cross Thomas Bay as a

2.8-mile-long undersea cable. The cable would be “jetted in,” or buried in the near-shore areas. The transmission line would then transition to an overhead vertical design on single wood poles, and extend overland approximately 4.5-miles from the shoreline of Thomas Bay across the Patterson Delta to the shoreline of Frederick Sound. It would then transition back to an undersea cable and continue 7.7-miles to the shoreline of Mitkof Island. The cable would be “jetted in,” or buried in the near-shore areas. From here, the line would transition back to an overhead design and continue overland 3.7-miles to the interconnection point at the existing Scow Bay substation near Petersburg.”

No relevant marine studies have been conducted or are proposed for the marine portions of this project. The effects of the undersea cable have not been identified. The effects of “jetting the cable in” have not been studied or identified.

The applicant cites an interconnection point at the existing Scow Bay substation near Petersburg. In previous conversations with Petersburg Municipal Power and Light (PMPL), the applicant has been told that the utility corridors are full and the PMPL system is a power dispersion system, not a power transmission system. The existing switchyards are at a maximum capacity and can't handle additional power from Cascade Creek. PMPL has also filed statements of this with FERC. The Southeast Alaska Power Agency (SEAPA) has stated that the applicant has failed to provide information on interconnection to the SEAPA grid and that the existing SEAPA grid can't efficiently handle what Cascade Creek LLC has proposed. The applicant *“is not proposing to construct new interconnect facilities and/or substations at the point of interconnection.”* This will put unfair burden on the existing utilities and transmission system if allowed. Any upgrades necessary for interties or substations, or additional substation construction should be identified as part of this project. Not including the cost of necessary intertie or power grid upgrades to allow project produced power to access markets would seem to be an error. It will certainly affect the cost feasibility of this project. Identification of the intertie or power grid expansion needs will help to identify any additional studies or expansion of studies as well as additional permitting to include areas affected by additional construction sites.

Page 10**(4) INSTALLED CAPACITY AND ENERGY PRODUCTION**

What is the justification for 70 MW? Without a connection to an additional water source, such as Ruth Lake, the Swan Lake system could seldom, if ever, provide the water necessary to generate 70 MW of power. Why has the capacity of the project been increased from previous applicant PP filings? This question has been asked but never answered.

Page 12

What information did the applicant use to identify anticipated increases in energy demand by 2028? The need for additional energy demands should be fully described and supported in the license application. The applicant mentions conversion to electric cars as a need for increased energy production and connection to cruise ships to reduce diesel fuel use while ships are in port. Where is the information to support electric car claims or connectivity of cruise ships as factors in the PP application?

“The Project will fulfill the public interest for reasonably priced, reliable, and environmentally sound source of renewable energy.” This statement needs to be clarified in light of the fact that here is no local market for this power and there is no ability to use the SEAPA power intertie grid for transmission at this time.

Page 14

The applicant states: *“Agency meetings were held on August 12, 2010 and September 28, 2010 to discuss the process and proposed studies.”* At the September 28, 2010 meeting the agencies were told of studies being conducted and told of a CCLLC determination of non-nexus on other studies. Studies identified by the agencies as baseline in nature and necessary for project evaluation were determined by the applicant as not necessary and non-nexus. This was after the applicant had visited with FERC representatives in Washington DC to seek project guidance. A request was made by the applicant for the agencies to sign a document that would allow these same baseline studies to be conducted in 2011, after submission of a FERC license application.

We declined to entertain this request. No study plans were provided at this agency meeting and attendees were told by the applicants representative that the aquatic resources study plan, sent to agencies by Cascade Creek LLC prior to the September 28, 2010 meeting, was sent by mistake and should be discarded.

Under the Communications Protocol (CP) signed and filed with FERC in 2007, meeting notes were to be distributed, comments from meeting participants collected and added to the minutes, and revised meeting minutes were to be redistributed and filed with FERC. This was not the case for ADF&G comments on the September 28, 2010 meeting minutes. ADF&G had to file comments directly with FERC.

The SD-2 was poorly written, not paginated and was nearly impossible to follow. In comments on the SD-2, ADF&G protested changes made to the CP by the applicant without consultation with the signatories of the 2007 CP. In previous FERC filings, we have also protested the elimination of the Petersburg Public Library as the local location for the public reading file. Repeated checks of the applicant website have shown that it has not been kept up to date and many required documents, comments and meeting notes have not been placed on the FERC website. It appears that many comments were not addressed or properly added to the reading files by the applicant.

We are confused by FERC's lack of acknowledgement regarding CP issues since the CP is the basis for public ability to participate in the FERC process. ADF&G's request of FERC to declare the SD-2 invalid due to procedural misconduct has also not been answered. The applicant has failed to address any SD-2 comments to date and has since filed a DLA and PDEA with FERC. The only change noted was the resumption of use of the Petersburg library as a public reading file.

The applicant stated that the SD-2 document provided final proposed study plans. Many of these plans do not reflect the needs identified during consultation. The studies completed by the applicant, were done before the agencies had draft study plans. This is a poor example of

consultation and coordination with resource agencies. To write study plans for any proposed project after studies are conducted can only be described as self serving and completely without scientific merit. Additionally, many studies lack sufficient data for a thorough analysis of resource issues or potential impacts and many studies lack sufficient data to define baseline conditions.

Recreational surveys were sent out and retracted, had incorrect cover sheets, contained errors in direction, are statistically flawed and thus are biased and lack scientific merit. In one case, the people being surveyed were directed to disregard the survey and to stop filling it out. This was confusing to the public and resulted in many surveys being discarded directly into the trash at the local post office. Suggested recreational studies were ignored and some studies were attempted at the wrong time of the year and did not target the correct user group.

Environmental Study Planning and Study Conduct

The applicant conducted only minor field work until mid summer of 2010. There were extensive meetings and conversations with agencies to identify study needs but the applicant failed to incorporate agency comments from these consultations. Missing from many aquatic studies are seasonal differences in habitat use, habitat availability and identification of spawning area or effects of lake water level changes in Swan Lake on the population of rainbow trout. Wildlife studies were identified but those completed are minimal and not sufficient for a thorough evaluation of the proposed project or affected resources.

Page 15

LICENSING WORK REMAINING

The fisheries studies listed by the applicant are only part of what needs to be studied for a complete evaluation. ADF&G does not view either applicant study designs or results presented in the applicant reports as adequate or complete. This includes aquatic, wildlife and recreational studies and reports.

Wildlife studies identified through extensive consultation included moose and mountain goat surveys. Neither study has been accomplished. The applicant contracted with ADF&G to expand the ongoing ADF&G wolverine study to include the Cascade Creek project area. The work was completed by ADF&G and reports have been submitted to FERC. The applicant entered into extensive consultation with ADF&G wildlife staff to develop the mountain goat study. In 2009 tagging and electronic tracking equipment was identified and reserved by ADF&G for use during the 2010 field season. A contract was never finalized and the reserved equipment is now being utilized in other studies. When Cascade Creek studies are scheduled for completion by ADF&G, there will be a delay in implementation due to seasonality, equipment availability and manufacturer re-conditioning necessary prior to deployment, as well as manpower schedule considerations. These studies probably could not start until sometime in 2012 or 2013.

Page 17**(2) FINANCING**

“The Applicant intends to obtain the remaining capital requirements for Project licensing through it’s affiliate, Alaska Hydro Corporation. In addition, there are Federal and State grant opportunities for development of renewable energy projects, and the Applicant intends to pursue these opportunities to supplement Project funding.”

From the Alaska Hydro Corporation website:

NEWS RELEASE**NOT FOR DISSEMINATION IN THE UNITED STATES****ALASKA HYDRO REPORTS 2010 FINANCIAL RESULTS**

May 3, 2011 – Vancouver, British Columbia – Alaska Hydro Corporation (the “Company”) today reported 2010 financial results. The net loss for the years ended December 31, 2010 was \$1,695,809 compared with a \$316,743 net loss for the same period in 2009. Total expenditures on the Company’s Cascade Creek hydroelectric projects in southern Alaska were \$1,193,269 for the year compared to \$209,101 for the same period in 2009. The company has a working capital deficit of \$143,749 at December 31, 2010. The Company’s Consolidated Financial Statements

and Management's Discussion and Analysis are available at <http://www.sedar.com>.

Even if Cascade Creek LLC or Alaska Hydro has found a new source of capital, the funding statement needs clarification. This news release dated May 3, 2011 was posted on the Alaska Hydro Corporation website.

(3) MARKET FOR POWER GENERATED

“Energy generated will be sold at wholesale price to local and regional markets, aggregators, or other wholesale purchasers of electric generation.”

In filings with FERC, PMPL and SEAPA state no ability to accept this power into the Petersburg local power dispersion grid or the SEAPA intertie for regional transmission. Without connection to local use or the Southeast Alaska intertie, there is no local or regional market for this power.

“The Project will fulfill the public interest for reasonably priced, reliable, and environmentally sound sources of renewable energy.”

Through public meetings, testimony at those meetings, comments on SD-1 and SD-2, reaction to recreation use surveys containing incorrect directions and filings by Petersburg residents, public interest has been predominately against this proposed hydropower development.

Thank you for consideration of our comments and concerns.

Sincerely,

/s/

Monte D. Miller
Statewide Hydropower Coordinator
Alaska Department of Fish and Game
Division of Sport Fish/RTS
333 Raspberry Road
Anchorage, Alaska 99518-1565

Cascade Creek Hydroelectric Project

FERC No. 12495-002

May 10, 2011

907 267-2312

e-copy: Bob Clark, ADF&G, Sport Fish/RTS
 Joe Klein, ADF&G, Sport Fish /RTS
 Shawn Johnson, ADF&G, Sport Fish/RTS
 Jackie Timothy, ADF&G, Habitat
 Doug Fleming, ADF&G,Sport Fish
 Rich Lowell, ADF&G, Wildlife
 Barbara Stanley, USDA-FS
 Chris Savage, USDA-FS
 Susan Walker, NOAA
 Lee Koss, BLM
 Dianne Rodman, FERC
 Nan Nalder
 Joe Nelson, PMPL

Document Content(s)

ADF&G Comments on PP App. 5-12-2011.PDF.....1-17