

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

KNIK ARM CROSSING PROJECT SCOPING MEETING

Pages 1-92, inclusive

Commencing at 5:00 p.m.

Wednesday, April 13, 2005

Egan Center

Anchorage, Alaska

1	I -N-D-E-X	
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	PUBLIC COMMENTS	PAGE
7		
8		
9	Introduction by Louise Stone	3
10	Comments and questions	4
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 Anchorage, Alaska, Wednesday, April 13, 2005

2 COMMENTS

3 MS. STONE: Now is the time for you to ask  
4 questions and ask for information if you want that. And  
5 we're going to start with -- I have currently 13 people  
6 on this list, and there's a whole lot more than 13 people  
7 here. You are all invited to speak, but we're going to  
8 start in the order of those who actually checked the box  
9 saying that "I want to speak."

10 At this point, we want to make sure that  
11 everybody has enough time before you-all get worn out of  
12 sitting too long. So we're going to put a 3-minute  
13 limit, but that doesn't mean that everybody should speak  
14 for three minutes. But what we want you to do is come  
15 and say what you want to say or ask the questions that  
16 you have and then if you run over three minutes, you're  
17 going to hear a little bell that's going to go ding and  
18 what we'll do is ask you to wrap up at that point.

19 If there's time at the end and there's still  
20 energy and interest you can come back and say more if you  
21 would like to. Okay? Is that going to work for you-all?

22 And also, when you come and speak or ask a  
23 question, we would like to you to state your name real  
24 clearly. Rosie has to type that down into the record.  
25 So that would be helpful to us. And I'll try to remember

1 to remind you if you need that.

2 So at this point -- oh, and Lisa is going to be  
3 recording a flow chart here. So we'll have a running  
4 record and you'll kind of see where we're going with this  
5 and what other people have said, as well as having heard  
6 it.

7 So we're ready to start. And I'd like to start  
8 with Mike Adams. And you want to say your name.

9 MR. ADAMS: Yeah. My name is Mike Adams. I  
10 manage the Chevron terminal out at the Port of Anchorage.  
11 I'm also the vice chair of the Upper Cook Inlet Security  
12 Committee and a member of the scanning of the Government  
13 Hill Community Council.

14 I'm not sure if I'm for or against the bridge  
15 at this point. And I'll kind of direct these at you,  
16 Kevin, and then you can respond.

17 One of the things I wanted to talk about are  
18 the different corridors. The Port of Anchorage corridor  
19 I find totally unacceptable because it wipes out half of  
20 my tank farm. So from a business standpoint, probably  
21 not a real good decision for me so that would impact me  
22 in jobs.

23 Seeing as how we're a defense field contractor  
24 for Elmendorf Air Force Base, I don't think it would be  
25 very acceptable to FFC either.

1           The Erickson Street or Elmendorf corridors look  
2 like they have some promise, although they have an impact  
3 on the community. And one of the things that's a  
4 negative in my mind is they both point down towards the  
5 C Street connector, which puts traffic right back into  
6 where we have been trying to get away from for a while,  
7 which is the downtown area.

8           And I think what we need to do is also look  
9 outside of the box and look at maybe coming off in a more  
10 northerly direction, east, into the military base to  
11 maybe avoid Government Hill, the school, try to get it in  
12 between housing on the military base, but yet direct  
13 it -- or any of these things should be directed towards  
14 Ingra/Gambell. And I would think that KABATA or HDR, or  
15 whatever the acronym you want to use for this group that  
16 moves forward, would want to work with the municipal  
17 20-year transportation plan that is just getting a lot of  
18 play right now, so that everybody is kind of in  
19 alignment. And maybe a good linkage would be toward that  
20 Ingra/Gambell corridor and the proposed connecting of the  
21 Glenn and the Seward Highways. And the cookies were very  
22 good.

23           MS. STONE: Thanks a lot. In all of that, is  
24 there something in particular you would like to hear from  
25 the project team or just leave it as these are the things

1 that you're concerned about that you want them to think  
2 about?

3 MR. ADAMS: I guess there really wasn't a  
4 question in there anywhere. Those are my comments.

5 MS. STONE: That's fine. That's good. And I  
6 also want to remind everyone that Federal Highway  
7 Administration is the lead federal agency -- is, in some  
8 ways the owner of this document, and the ultimate  
9 decision maker. And that's why Edrie is here, is that --  
10 for her to be listening directly to all of your input.

11 MR. ADAMS: Do I have time to just add a brief  
12 comment?

13 MS. STONE: Sure.

14 MR. ADAMS: The other thing, besides impacting  
15 several of the tank farms with the Port of Anchorage  
16 corridor, it also would require closing down for  
17 construction of that corridor, and the only entrance is  
18 the Port of Anchorage. So I don't know how that would be  
19 done, but it certainly would disrupt business at the port  
20 and of course, as you know, the vast majority of goods  
21 getting to Alaska comes through the Port of Anchorage.

22 MS. STONE: It shows good thinking on the  
23 how-to of it. And, in fact, it's the how-to's that we  
24 need to be looking at in order to evaluate this project.

25 Gene Kulawik. And after Gene, Stuart Hall, if

1 you want to speak and then Vic Fischer.

2 MR. KULAWIK: My name is Gene Kulawik,  
3 K-U-L-A-W-I-K. And I work in the construction business  
4 and currently am a consultant. And I had several  
5 concerns. There was a bridge built many years ago. And  
6 the citizens in the community decided to build it. And  
7 they bonded it and then they directed the cost, and then  
8 the construction and the planning. And it turns out they  
9 paid it off in due time -- paid the bonds off. And it's  
10 probably the most famous bridge in the world, the Golden  
11 Gate. It was done by a community, and I think the  
12 Anchorage community needs to have -- they're going to  
13 have the biggest impact, so they should make the most  
14 comment and try to direct it.

15 Some of things that I'm concerned about, one is  
16 if we're going to build a new facility and add to the  
17 current infrastructure, that we've been underfunded in  
18 the maintenance of our highway system for many years, and  
19 currently there's a \$40 million shortfall. So I think we  
20 need to get something in place to ensure that the funding  
21 will be there. You know, we barely get around here in  
22 the winter where our road system infrastructure is not  
23 designed for a winter city. And we need to figure that  
24 out and that all plays into this.

25 And another question I have, I notice that the

1 toll charges are planned. And how much will they be and  
2 for how long will they be in place? I think that's -- I  
3 haven't heard anything that says it will be on a time  
4 limit, or if it's going to go on for infinity. Anyway,  
5 we need that answer.

6 MS. STONE: Would you like that answer now? A  
7 quick answer.

8 MR. KULAWIK: Pardon me?

9 MS. STONE: Would you like an answer now? A  
10 quick answer.

11 MR. KULAWIK: Well, I don't think there is an  
12 answer now.

13 MS. STONE: So Darryl, would you -- this got  
14 asked last night so you've had some practice.

15 MR. JORDAN: Many of you may already know that  
16 we won't know the answer until we're much further down  
17 this process. We need to know the cost of whatever  
18 alternative comes up in this process. We need to know  
19 how much reason we get from the state and federal and  
20 other revenue sources that might use the crossing. And  
21 then the maintenance cost is a big piece of this. Some  
22 have predicted that it will be maybe a year into  
23 construction before we can give a discreet answer.

24 However, in previous days in 1984, for some of  
25 the crossing, for a much more expensive bridge with more

1 federal contribution they're looking about 2 to \$3 at  
2 that time and thought that was a reasonable range for  
3 toll.

4 The board is -- of KABATA, the toll authority  
5 that's doing this, is probably the only one that can tell  
6 you whether they intend to end this toll in some  
7 foreseeable future or not. And I know they have not made  
8 that decision yet.

9 MS. STONE: If there's something we can answer  
10 directly then we will. And you had some more, sir?

11 MR. KULAWIK: It was on the tip of my tongue.  
12 Over the years of observing several projects that have  
13 been perpetrated and developed and have failed -- we call  
14 them boondoggles. We have the Healy clean coal. We have  
15 a fish factory out here by the airport. And you have the  
16 Delta Barley Grain elevators. And I wonder -- I would  
17 like to see us have the opportunity to vote on this when  
18 we get a package together and decide if we really want to  
19 build it or not, because our track record hasn't been  
20 very good. And it's been in the hundreds of millions of  
21 dollars that have gone down the tube. So maybe this time  
22 we can do it better and maybe we can do it right.

23 I know the citizens of San Francisco did it  
24 right, so maybe we can do it. No other comments.

25 MS. STONE: Thank you very much. And so the

1 next person on my list, Stuart Hall. You have question  
2 marks. Did you want to speak?

3 MR. HALL: I'm going to defer to Vic Fischer  
4 and all of the (indiscernible).

5 MS. STONE: Vic Fischer?

6 MR. FISCHER: My name is Dave Fischer. I also  
7 had a question mark opposite my name.

8 MS. STONE: I saw that but you got drafted.

9 MR. FISCHER: I might as well say something. I  
10 have a number of issues that I'm interested in, the whole  
11 economic and financial structure of the proposal and it's  
12 operation in the future. I assume these issues will be  
13 addressed as we go along over the next year or so.

14 I do hope that this will not be a steamroller  
15 program, that people who are involved in the program, in  
16 the project, will look at it objectively and not just run  
17 away and have this great multimillion dollars markup  
18 there that, let's have more jobs for construction  
19 regardless of what happens later.

20 But my concern is one that hasn't been touched  
21 upon so far as I know whatsoever. And that is the  
22 governmental structure that exists and will exist in the  
23 future. When Alaska drafted a constitution for the  
24 future state of Alaska, we established a local government  
25 system of cities and boroughs. And the underlying

1 concept was that a borough would cover the entire urban  
2 region. Here we are facing a situation where we have two  
3 separate governmental jurisdictions that would be  
4 connected by a bridge, each having a port, each having  
5 the land that they care about and want to tax that will  
6 support the infrastructure.

7 I think that some very serious consideration  
8 needs to be given to possible serious future conflicts.  
9 And we should examine the possibility of establishing one  
10 regional metropolitan jurisdiction that will cover the  
11 Anchorage metropolitan and ancillary area, and the area  
12 ancillary to the proposed Knik Arm crossing on the west  
13 side. This needs to be addressed early. It needs to be  
14 addressed not just by the authority, but this is a state  
15 question. The constitution is based on the state dealing  
16 with these regional issues. And I hope this will be a  
17 major subject for consideration. Thank you.

18 MS. STONE: So as far as governmental  
19 infrastructure that's a bridge, in terms of governmental  
20 infrastructure as well as transportation bridge.

21 MR. FISCHER: Looking at this in terms of not  
22 only the economics of it, not only traffic patterns but  
23 also the governmental structure -- administrative  
24 structure.

25 MS. STONE: Thank you. Okay. Susanne Di Picto

1 and -- are you here? And then Connie Struempf would be  
2 after you.

3 MS. DI PICTO: Hi. My name is Susanne  
4 Di Picto. I live in Government Hill. And some of us in  
5 the community have been following this project for a  
6 little while now. I wanted to just say a word about  
7 Government Hill. For those of you who don't know the  
8 community, it's a great neighborhood. It's an old  
9 fashioned neighborhood. We all kind of know each other.  
10 We look after each other. We have a great sense of  
11 cohesion.

12 And I want people to know that because the  
13 possibility of a route through our neighborhood would  
14 really divide our neighborhood in half. It would cut off  
15 the school. It would cut off AT&T Alascom. It would  
16 impact -- through its physical intrusion into the  
17 neighborhood and the taking of single-family homes there  
18 potentially, it would degrade the social integrity of our  
19 neighborhood.

20 And I just want to say that that's an  
21 intangible, but it needs to be studied, quantified, and  
22 taken into account because Anchorage -- a great city is  
23 really nothing more than a collection of great  
24 neighborhoods. And if we, as a community, don't care for  
25 our neighborhoods, then our city is going to be degraded

1 as a result.

2 I also wanted to comment on the purposes and  
3 needs statement. I think that the purpose of a bridge  
4 should be to bring economic benefit to a community. And  
5 I think that the purpose this bridge should be to bring  
6 economic benefit to Anchorage. And the corollary to that  
7 is, we need to study that. So I was real interested in  
8 the comments from Art Thomas, who's on contract here.

9 And I think a couple of things that need to be  
10 studied and addressed. First of all, we need to look at  
11 what kind of impact building this bridge would have on  
12 the tax base in Anchorage, not just property taxes, but  
13 homeowners paying, more importantly even possibly  
14 property taxes that commercial and industrial interests  
15 pay.

16 I think we need to look at what kind of an  
17 economic impact building a bridge might have on our  
18 school district. How many kids would be in Anchorage  
19 schools. I think that we need to look at the economic  
20 impact that the bridge might have on property values in  
21 Anchorage.

22 One of the things that you see over and over  
23 again in the Lower 48 is green fields are opened up  
24 because of large transportation projects, that the urban  
25 core degrades, property values deteriorate, degrade. The

1 urban -- what was once a vibrant urban community can  
2 become a ghost town, or an under utilized gray field.

3 And we really need to study that because if  
4 that's going to happen, we need to plan for it. If we  
5 are going to be losing tax base we need to plan for it.  
6 If we're going to be losing kids out of our schools we  
7 need to be able to plan for that. We need to have those  
8 answers before this bridge goes forward. In fact, I  
9 would say that there's no reason to build a bridge,  
10 unless it's going to have a positive economic benefit on  
11 Anchorage.

12 MS. STONE: You've given a lot of thought to  
13 what some of those elements are that would be part of  
14 that. Good.

15 MS. DI PICTO: Thanks.

16 MS. STONE: Thank you. Did you want to respond  
17 at all, or are all those things that you're looking at?

18 MR. BURDEN: Those are all good points to --  
19 they have been identified in a lot of the interviews that  
20 we've had. And we're focusing on trying to --

21 MS. STONE: Right. So Pat Burden who has just  
22 said that those are -- many of these issues that have  
23 been identified and that they are focusing on.

24 MS. STRUEMPF: My name is Connie Struempf and  
25 I'm a resident of Anchorage. And I just want to say that

1 I'm in favor of this project, and in favor of the  
2 crossing. I think it will provide additional access for  
3 industry, commercial business, and residential  
4 development. I feel it will decrease vehicular  
5 congestion on the only road out of town and give us  
6 another option.

7 It's my understanding that it's been a long  
8 time since Alaska has built another road out of town.  
9 And I'm looking forward to having another option. And I  
10 think this will benefit both the Mat-Su and the Anchorage  
11 basin. Thank you.

12 MS. STONE: Thank you. Pauline -- is it  
13 Refner -- is next and then Jerry Peters and then  
14 Stephanie Kessler. Pauline, are you here? Pauline?

15 SPEAKER: She's here, but she checked the wrong  
16 box.

17 MS. STONE: She can cross that box. That's  
18 fine. It's not required that you speak just because you  
19 checked the box.

20 Jerry Peters?

21 MR. PETERS: That's me. I'm not going to speak  
22 either.

23 MS. STONE: Okay. Stephanie Kessler, and then  
24 after Stephanie Kessler I have Kay Knudsen and then Sean  
25 Hollland.

1 MS. KESSLER: Hi. My name is Stephanie  
2 Kessler. And I'm the president of the Government Hill  
3 Community Council. And you've heard all about Government  
4 Hill. Thanks to Suzanne's wonderful description about  
5 our great neighborhood. And if anything, she undersold  
6 how fabulous we really are.

7 I have a couple of comments. And they're  
8 comments, they're not questions. First up, is the needs  
9 and purpose statement. A needs and purpose statement is  
10 sort of like the defining montra of a project. And, so,  
11 the needs and purpose statement should be based on facts  
12 and supporting data should made available. A needs and  
13 purpose statement is not a vision statement. A vision  
14 statement and a mission statement are different than  
15 needs and purpose.

16 So I'd like to just make sure that when we do  
17 our needs and purpose on this, that we clarify it between  
18 those two.

19 Next up are the boundaries that have been  
20 delineated so far. HDR and (indiscernible) each agree  
21 with the Federal Highway Administration. We've been  
22 meeting hellbent with them over the last couple of weeks  
23 and have had quite a bit of conversation regarding the  
24 boundaries. And what we would like to propose from our  
25 perspective is that we think outside the box, the box

1 that is currently drawn on the boundaries for the  
2 project.

3 And specifically, we'd like to look at all  
4 alternatives, including a northern route. And we think  
5 that a northern route may actually make more sense,  
6 because it will dump into an existing transportation  
7 infrastructure, which actually leads into my third point,  
8 and that's the current alternatives are all dumping into  
9 the A-C couplet. And if you want to put a knife in the  
10 stake -- or in the heart of your project, running it  
11 through the A-C couplet is that knife. And, so, I  
12 strongly urge you to consider alternative routes.

13 The A-C couplet is already close to capacity.  
14 All of us who drive it regularly know that. And it is  
15 going through the heart of downtown Anchorage. The last  
16 thing we want is to bring additional heavy traffic  
17 through downtown when we're in the midst of business with  
18 of the museum and the birch trees. Do you really think  
19 we want to, you know, have a major freeway going by right  
20 by renovation projects that are taking place in downtown.

21 Finally, one thing that I haven't seen in our  
22 discussions with HDR and I haven't seen on the  
23 placards -- and I was thinking about this last night --  
24 are development requirements. Now we have a need  
25 statement, and I'm sure we'll have a mission statement

1 and a vision and all that. But one of the things I  
2 haven't seen are requirements. And, so, I would like to  
3 propose that we do have requirements. And here are my  
4 two proposals for requirements.

5           Number one is, if we're going to build a  
6 bridge, then I think there needs to be a net economic  
7 benefit to Anchorage. We should not build a bridge that  
8 harms an existing community. If we're going to build a  
9 bridge, it needs to be a win-win for both sides of the  
10 bridge.

11           And then I'll just give you my second one and  
12 then I'm done. The other thing that I think the bridge  
13 should do -- and I really like the gentleman's remarks  
14 about the Golden Gate Bridge because I think it does help  
15 demonstrate nicely -- a bridge is a wonderful opportunity  
16 to enhance the social fabric and social cohesiveness of  
17 existing communities if the bridge is planned correctly,  
18 and it has the buy-ins from the communities.

19           And, so, I think one of the requirements of  
20 this project should be that the bridge enhances the  
21 social fabric of the existing communities on either side  
22 of the bridge.

23           Thank you.

24           MS. STONE: Thank you. And my assumption is  
25 that Government Hill is going to continue to work with

1 the project team and be looking at it -- Stephanie?

2 MS. KESSLER: Yes.

3 MS. STONE: Oh, okay. So my assumption  
4 Government Hill will continue to work with the project  
5 team to look at exploring alternatives to the A-C couplet  
6 and look at what the social fabric means. So I think  
7 those are very important questions to be addressed.

8 Kay Knudsen and then Sean Holland and then  
9 Vern Risinger.

10 MR. SPEAKER: Sean checked the wrong box.

11 MS. STONE: Would you say your name, please.

12 MS. KNUDSEN: It's Kay Knudsen. And I'm  
13 certainly also one that would surely want this bridge to  
14 go through sooner than later. We certainly have been  
15 waiting many, many years. And I, of course, hope that we  
16 do not damage any existing communities. But I cannot  
17 believe we cannot make a difference and try a different  
18 way to enhance both sides and both communities. And how  
19 wonderful it would be to be able to drive to Nancy Lake,  
20 or Big Lake, or Fairbanks or Timbucktoo finally, and get  
21 out of this nightmare that has become Anchorage.

22 And I certainly can see where the economic  
23 development would surely be a point, in fact, to try and  
24 see the best route, the best way to build this and to get  
25 it going finally. Thank you.

1 MS. STONE: Thank you.

2 Okay. Vern Risinger.

3 MR. RISINGER: You got it right. I'm  
4 surprised. I'm Vern Risinger. And I'm a Longshoreman at  
5 the Port of Anchorage. This project, if done on course,  
6 will correlate almost exactly with the port expansion.  
7 And I haven't seen anything that would lead me to believe  
8 that there is any intent to integrate two projects, as  
9 far as access to the Port of Anchorage and access to this  
10 bridge. It just seems like something that should be  
11 taken care of.

12 Right now the access for trucks and cars into  
13 the Port of Anchorage is dismal. It's just a bottleneck.  
14 Rail traffic stops everything. They're putting in new  
15 rail lines to the port. And if they start putting trains  
16 on those rails, it's just going to slow things down to a  
17 stop several times a day. And I think a corridor that  
18 has nothing do with the A-C couplet is the best idea, and  
19 it should also incorporate rail -- rail, truck and  
20 vehicular traffic to the port, which is on the way to the  
21 bridge. That's pretty much about it.

22 MS. STONE: Thank you. And does anyone on the  
23 team want to answer this question of integration with  
24 other activities and other plans as to the port?

25 MR. DOYLE: I should have mentioned in the

1 beginning, similar to these public scoping meetings,  
2 we've been having agency scoping meetings. And we've  
3 partnered with federal, state, local regulatory agencies,  
4 be it natural environment, permitting wet lands,  
5 wildlife, belugas, protected species. We have  
6 (indiscernible) and tribal consultations and local  
7 governments. And we have the Mat-Su Borough and the  
8 Municipality of Anchorage, and the Port of Anchorage, the  
9 military and the Alaska Railroad, all part of this agency  
10 working group. We're meeting again in a few weeks. So  
11 we're on a regular two to three, four week basis now of  
12 sharing data and trying to jointly develop the project so  
13 that there is this synergy in trying to work the plans.  
14 Everybody -- since the project is in its early stages and  
15 everybody is trying to protect their best interest and  
16 what their plans are. And it's just kind of in the  
17 initial stages of how do we integrate these plans  
18 together.

19 So there are efforts going on very similar to  
20 this with agencies and government staff. And we've had  
21 daily meetings almost now with the Port of Anchorage,  
22 almost every other day lately, and some military meetings  
23 and stuff, to try to work one on one for specific  
24 interest, but then trying to bring everybody together in  
25 a cohesive way to see how it all fits in the big picture.

1 So that's going on behind the scenes, but a point well  
2 taken.

3 The two improvements, particularly at the port,  
4 are very parallel tracks. So we're hoping we can join  
5 these through that corridor so we don't conflict with one  
6 another and we can compliment one another with our  
7 projects.

8 MS. STONE: Kim Frenzy. You have a question  
9 mark by your name. Do you want to speak?

10 MS. FRENSEY: Yes, I do.

11 MS. STONE: Good. Hi there.

12 MS. FRENSEY: Hi. I'm Kim Frensey. And I  
13 work downtown, and born and raised in Anchorage. And I  
14 think its time that we need to really take a good look at  
15 our structure with our -- you know, the railroad and with  
16 the highway. And get it out of downtown and don't even  
17 touch -- what she said earlier. I think we need to pull  
18 it out of Government Hill because that area, I went to  
19 school there. And we had a great time. My dad used to  
20 drive me every day. We need to look at how we can get  
21 around that. It's a community downtown. We're very  
22 close knit. The actual people that live down there and  
23 the businesses, we need to just take it out. My feeling  
24 is I do want the bridge, but we need to get it away from  
25 downtown, and work with the military and figure out

1 another alternative. So that's what I would like to see.

2 Thank you very much.

3 MS. STONE: Those in particular who have  
4 mentioned Government Hill, I wonder if you've taken a  
5 look at or maybe, you've seen, there's a model over here  
6 as the project team has been wrestling with this question  
7 of if it were to go in the Government Hill area, how  
8 could it be done in such a way that would be less  
9 disruptive. Is that accurate to say? And that model is  
10 an idea that has been looked at. So you may want to look  
11 at that model and during the open house talk with a  
12 project team member about what that concept is.

13 Warren Smallwoods and Steve Cleary and then  
14 Lorna Kahus.

15 MR. SMALLWOODS: Good evening. My name is  
16 Warren James Smallwoods, Sr. And I would like to say,  
17 first of all, that we are thinking out of the box by just  
18 putting a bridge up. And second, my concern is on both  
19 sides of the bridge once the bridge is constructed. And  
20 my question on the Mat-Su side is, are they -- are the  
21 Corps of Engineers will construct or lay out a city on  
22 the other side, or are we just going to be a grab type of  
23 land on the other side without laying out a nice city  
24 where everybody will enjoy the other side of the bridge  
25 instead of just land owners?

1                   And my question on this side of the bridge is  
2                   that, we're talking about how can we construct a road  
3                   that will not hurt the rest of the community. And I have  
4                   thought about maybe putting in a four-lane highway on the  
5                   outside of Knik and the Turnagain shorelines that will be  
6                   constructed by pilasters and concrete, four lanes with  
7                   all the trails that it will need also, that will help the  
8                   city come along.

9                   One thing about that road on the outside of  
10                  Knik Arm Bridge is that it will lead all the way up to  
11                  Eagle River. That will give them another outlet to  
12                  Anchorage, which they have been asking for for the  
13                  longest. If we could go to the North Eagle River bridge,  
14                  build a road all the way up to the North Eagle River  
15                  Bridge, and then empty out at the weigh station on the  
16                  other side of Turnagain and whatever, will take care of  
17                  all the trucks, the traffic that will circle around the  
18                  city.

19                 Now, one thing about that bridge is you have a  
20                 lot of trucks coming in on that bridge. Once the trucks  
21                 get in, they're coming downtown. Without a north and  
22                 south pathway, they will have to come downtown.

23                 Now, you have many, many exits that you can  
24                 build into that, such as Fourth, Ninth, Raspberry Road,  
25                 Diamond, and the like that will empty through that road.

1                   So when you think outside the box, think things  
2                   that would help everybody, not just that we need a  
3                   bridge, and we need a pathway that would help out the  
4                   whole community.

5                   Thank you.

6                   MS. STONE: All right. Thanks. To give a lot  
7                   of ideas of different ways of doing this and one of the  
8                   ideas you expressed first, was that there needs to be  
9                   some kind of planning going out on the Mat-Su side of  
10                  this.

11                  John, did you want to say anything about  
12                  planning and where this fits with planning?

13                  MR. MCPHERSON: Well, part of the challenge  
14                  the project team has is trying to anticipate how changes  
15                  are going to occur on the Mat-Su Borough side. The  
16                  Mat-Su Borough does have planning powers, but they  
17                  haven't elected to enact zoning and take full advantage  
18                  of all those planning powers.

19                  So that makes it difficult to identify exactly  
20                  what it will look like over there with and without the  
21                  bridge.

22                  So what we've done is taken an approach where  
23                  we have a committee formed with the Mat-Su Borough and  
24                  Anchorage planners to work through some of these issues  
25                  in terms of growth and how development -- how the

1 planning factors of industry growth will occur over  
2 there.

3 MS. STONE: Thank you. Steve Cleary and then  
4 Lorna Kahus.

5 MR. CLEARY: Good evening. My name is Steve  
6 Cleary. I'm the executive director of the Alaska Public  
7 Interest Research Group. And I want to thank you for the  
8 opportunity to speak tonight.

9 I had actually -- I guess I'd have to state  
10 what Nancy Regan wrote and that's just to say no. I  
11 don't think the bridge should be built. I want us not  
12 to only think outside the box, but to think outside the  
13 bridge.

14 We've been -- we been saying we can come up  
15 with some more questions on how to build the bridge  
16 correctly. The one I want to focus on is why to build  
17 the bridge at all.

18 We heard it's going to connect to another  
19 community, but it's actually going to connect to Point  
20 MacKenzie and then wind its way into Wasilla, not  
21 reducing commuting time at all.

22 And I think we need to plan more wisely and  
23 develop more wisely what I'll call the California Mile is  
24 what we seem to be on right now, where we open up more  
25 land with more roads, which gets us more sprawl and more

1 congestion on those new roads.

2 And so I'd like us to plan wisely and perhaps  
3 spend our money on a commuter rail system, which we could  
4 name after Don Young. He's looking for a legacy,  
5 something to name after himself. We could name a  
6 commuter rail line out to the Valley after Don Young, and  
7 that would reduce congestion by actually taking cars off  
8 the road rather than creating roads which then drives  
9 more cars onto those roads.

10 In a recent American Society of Civil Engineers  
11 report, they found that 30 percent of Alaska's bridges  
12 are structurally deficient or functionally obsolete,  
13 33 percent of roads are in poor condition, and that  
14 driving on roads that are in need of repair cost Alaskans  
15 motorists one \$102 million in extra vehicle repairs and  
16 operating costs.

17 So we see our precious transportation dollars  
18 being diverted into a mega project or a couple of mega  
19 projects, that we believe are going to siphon  
20 transportation dollars away from fixing and maintaining  
21 the roads that already exist.

22 And, so, we would like to see the focus more on  
23 the purpose and the needs that seem to have been glossed  
24 over now that this is rolling. And I hope we can take a  
25 step back and focus on that.

1                   We hear a 4 to 6 -- 400 to \$600 million cost  
2 for the bridge right now. But the original estimates  
3 were 1.5 up to 2 billion. And we need to focus on the  
4 fact that Don Young isn't going to be there forever,  
5 won't be able to pull in as much money as he does right  
6 now.

7                   And there's also the question of fairness and  
8 should Alaskans get 9 or \$10 for every dollar that we  
9 contribute to the Federal Government for this project?  
10 And if Don Young isn't in charge, how are we going to be  
11 able to get the money to maintain our roads and to keep  
12 up the bridge that might be built.

13                   Thank you.

14                   MS. STONE: So you join -- there's another  
15 individual that talks about maintenance of the existing  
16 facilities. And that was a point that he made there, and  
17 then the woman before talked about the purpose and needs,  
18 wanting to make sure that was supported by data and  
19 wasn't just a mission statement.

20                   MR. CLEARY: Right. And is there -- I didn't  
21 have a chance to read all the boards. Is there a purpose  
22 and needs section?

23                   MS. STONE: There is. There is.

24                   MR. CLEARY: Okay.

25                   MS. STONE: Right.

1 MR. CLEARY: So that's highlighted?

2 MS. STONE: That's exactly right. And if this  
3 group would like to have the project team just give you a  
4 quick summary of the purpose and needs that's been  
5 evolving, or that exists now, we can do that as well, or  
6 you can look at it individually at the board. So it's  
7 really up to --

8 MS. LOY-GRAY: Actually, there's a project  
9 description section on the back of --

10 MS. STONE: Okay. So in the back there. And  
11 you made the comment about cost. It is now a 4 to \$600  
12 price tag, and how can that be when it was one and a half  
13 billion dollars before. So I would like Darryl to say a  
14 few words about how come.

15 MR. JORDAN: Thank you. Yes, the cost  
16 estimate back in 1955 was actually 35 million, but we  
17 understand why that estimate is no longer effective, that  
18 time has eroded the time value of money. As the '84  
19 estimate went on, we need to remember that in that time  
20 frame, which was '82 when they did the study, there was  
21 no Minnesota bypass. There was no A-C couplet, there was  
22 no bike path to cross.

23 And, so, they actually had to go all the way  
24 back into the Ingra, Hyder, Gambell, Ingra Streets. And  
25 then they had a Golden Gate type bridge over through the

1 Ship Creek area, and then connected all the way up to the  
2 Parks Highway. And time has evolved and we no longer  
3 need to deal with that because that infrastructure is in  
4 place. So this project is a much smaller project than  
5 was envisioned back in 1982 because of that  
6 infrastructure.

7 We are hoping in the next newsletter -- if you  
8 signed up to get our newsletter -- to go over the cost  
9 and somebody to help explain why it is a much smaller  
10 project, and why the certainty of that cost frame is a  
11 little better.

12 The hard part about this is, we do not have a  
13 preferred alternative because that's part of this  
14 process. There is no design. Because there's no design,  
15 we can't count bolts, cubic yards of gravel, armored rock  
16 piling. And there is a lot of uncertainty in the cost  
17 estimate.

18 What we do is we take one alignment that might  
19 work and cost of that and we put some certainty to that,  
20 and that's the best we can do at this time.

21 MR. CLEARY: Wasn't the 1.5 billion was from a  
22 through January '03 HDR and another Parsons start-up  
23 date?

24 MR. JORDAN: Correct. What they were  
25 instructed to do is to update the 1982 estimate. So they

1 went back and literally took the project as then existed  
2 in 1982 and then cost back.

3 MS. STONE: So that was a much bigger project  
4 than the one here today.

5 MR. CLEARY: Sure. One final question. So the  
6 4 to 600 million, is that above the street funding, or  
7 would that include a tunnel under Government Hill or the  
8 road on the other side?

9 MR. JORDAN: There's already been some break  
10 down of costs. You will see that the approaches on east  
11 and west side are included. The access to those  
12 approaches, and the structure itself are broken down in  
13 both the subsurface for the pilings and the structure  
14 itself. So it's a -- and all the contingencies, design,  
15 the program, the approach contingencies, escalation,  
16 inflation, and the management to actually get the project  
17 constructed as well.

18 And we will be happy to answer your questions  
19 privately. So be sure you get the number. So if you do  
20 find some holes or some ideas, we would like to hear  
21 those, too.

22 MS. STONE: Great. So I have Lorna Kahus next.  
23 So you all know, I have 10 and two question marks after  
24 Lorna. So that gives you a sense of who signed up and  
25 then we can hear from any of the rest of you who would

1 I like to speak. So Lorna, are you here?

2 MS. KAHUS. Well, I'd like to let you-all know  
3 that I do my research before I run my mouth. And you-all  
4 know what a foreign trade zone is. That's where you  
5 bring goods in from a foreign country into the United  
6 States and customs is there. Because of our foreign  
7 trade zone up here at the airport, we move over -- we  
8 move more goods through there than any other  
9 international airport in the United States and second in  
10 the world to Japan. Over 4,000 people have gone to work  
11 since that started. I started that, because I did a lot  
12 of research first because I knew we needed that here at  
13 the top of the world.

14 I've also done some research on the point of  
15 having a bridge or a new direction. Anchorage is out of  
16 buildable land. They even shrank the size of building  
17 lots here up on the hillside, and now we have over  
18 1,400 cases of hepatitis because everybody is drinking  
19 everybody else's potty water. And that's a fact.

20 And, now, the only solution to true  
21 transportation and availability without a tax base that  
22 will ruin you -- because of the infrastructure over in  
23 MacKenzie alone will be greater per month to pay than  
24 they pay back to the bank for the new home loan unless  
25 you're just going to have a cabin. You're not going to

1 do that. You're going to want to have a home.

2 So I am now working on a subway from the  
3 airport to Dimond Center, from Dimond Center to Kenai  
4 Marine Port, Kenai Marine Port to Kenai Airport, Kenai  
5 Airport to the city of Soldotna, where the ground house  
6 would be. Over 188 people so far will be employed in  
7 that to operate it, not to build it.

8 Haliburton heard about it and they have been  
9 here twice. The first time they talked to me about it  
10 and to find out some other things. And they called me  
11 and wanted to have a meeting with somebody from the state  
12 that could verify what I was saying, and verify me. And,  
13 so, the Lieutenant Governor and Haliburton and myself, we  
14 all -- there were two Haliburton representatives that  
15 came up here. And we all had breakfast together and  
16 discussed this, and they liked it. Haliburton wants to  
17 do the dig.

18 The Corps of Army Engineers, they say that we  
19 can do the dig, we begin it, but we have to have a place  
20 to put the dirt. I'm working now with the airport to put  
21 the dirt.

22 You have to understand that all of the  
23 infrastructure is in -- in the Kenai/Soldotna area.  
24 There's paved road, power and telephone right up to the  
25 park. And that's a quarter of a mile from the mouth of

1 Turnagain Arm.

2 They have schools larger than they need.  
3 Hospitals, libraries larger than they need because they  
4 planned ahead. And it will be -- there's a lot of people  
5 that work in Anchorage that live down there and they  
6 drive back and forth.

7 The subway will do many miles an hour with  
8 freight and people. And the telephone companies, the  
9 electric companies, the gas lines, can all run through  
10 without being exposed to the weather or weather  
11 maintenance. And it's not going to be a -- where you  
12 drive your car through there. It's going to be a train  
13 on rubber tires. And it will be 30 minutes from the  
14 airport to Soldotna. That's practical. Everything is  
15 in. It's just a matter -- and I have a means of  
16 diversifying the payment of that. Each location will  
17 diversify four times for city, for state, and federal  
18 financing. This is alternative to the Knik Arm Bridge.  
19 This is commonsense instead of Knik Arm Bridge.

20 MS. STONE: But the three minutes are up. And  
21 if you would like to wrap up here that would be great.

22 MS. KAHUS: That's it.

23 MS. STONE: Randy Virgin, David Ring, and then  
24 Lois Epstein.

25 MR. VIRGIN: Good evening. My name is Randy

1 Virgin. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I  
2 really appreciate it. I'm the director of Alaska Center  
3 for the Environment. We're a membership group based here  
4 in Anchorage. We've been here for over 30 years. We  
5 have over 7,000 dues paying Alaskans who are members of  
6 ACE. Our organization exists because we love Alaska and  
7 we want to keep it special for ourselves and for our  
8 future generations. And we all love this place and we  
9 all live here for a reason.

10 I have to admit, looking at this project, I'm  
11 pretty skeptical. I -- you know, it's interesting that  
12 I've heard from the boosters of the bridge talk about it  
13 as -- talk about the Golden Gate Bridge. Another  
14 gentleman earlier was making that comparison. But, you  
15 know, that's the sort of imagery that, you know, this is  
16 a great landmark and it's connected two populated areas.

17 When I look at this project I don't see the  
18 Golden Gate Bridge. I think more of our experience in  
19 Alaska. The bridge in Cordova, the million dollar bridge  
20 that goes literally to nowhere and they're now having to  
21 rebuild the thing so it doesn't fall in the river, and it  
22 doesn't go anywhere.

23 The Whittier Tunnel, the toll is now 12 to 15  
24 bucks a trip. The usership has never reached the  
25 projection that they -- that the project team said that

1 that project would serve.

2 You know, in the boondoggles the list is long.  
3 We can all read off of that list. I think this fits into  
4 that story here in Alaska. You know, transportation  
5 dollars are about priorities. And, you know, I notice  
6 the question and answer sheet where it says that money  
7 for the bridge would be earmarked and therefore not  
8 available for other projects. So that's only with the  
9 political will there to make that earmark.

10 The fact is, there's a finite number of federal  
11 transportation dollars that can come to this region. And  
12 I think that the type of money that we're talking about  
13 here can be much better spent to serve this community on  
14 other projects.

15 I really think that the project and the  
16 project -- it's not the project team. You guys are doing  
17 your jobs. The project itself, the people who want this  
18 project have to justify the expenditure.

19 600 million, 1.5 billion. These numbers are  
20 all so big, no one can even comprehend how much money  
21 that really is. And I think everyone knows in the back  
22 of their mind that these big projects never -- they  
23 always cost more than they're planned to cost.

24 It wouldn't take drive time to Palmer and most  
25 of Wasilla. It's -- it would cut maybe 15 minutes off of

1 the drive to Fairbanks. It would encourage sloth outside  
2 of Anchorage, and it's likely to drain tax base and could  
3 damage hopes for the redevelopment and reinvestment in  
4 Anchorage, and it limits the ability to really become a  
5 thriving city.

6 It threatens the migration patterns of beluga  
7 whales which are a species of special concern, and salmon  
8 through an entire region. The causeways that are planned  
9 for this bridge -- because we all know that Cook Inlet is  
10 a really turbid water body. And no one really knows how  
11 it all works because it's so darn complicated, but we  
12 know the siltation is a big problem. The Port of  
13 Anchorage siltation and dredging costs have sky rocketed  
14 in the last decade.

15 There's no doubt in my mind that these  
16 causeways are going to cause major problems in the  
17 siltation patterns in the Inlet for the poor critters,  
18 for all kinds of people.

19 And, you know, when you think about wreaking  
20 havoc on our neighborhood, both Government Hill and  
21 downtown, both which are really -- I really love  
22 downtown. I think it's the heart of Anchorage. And I  
23 think those folks from Government Hill, I think -- you  
24 know, if you put this through my neighborhood, and you  
25 think about putting this through that collector road and

1 my response is, "over my dead body."

2 I don't think that it's responsible for us to  
3 put that kind of burden in our neighborhood and here in  
4 our town. In fact, I don't think it's responsible to  
5 spend this kind of money on a project that really hasn't  
6 demonstrated or proved itself.

7 MS. STONE: Are you about to wrap up?

8 MR. VIRGIN: Yeah, I'm done. So, thanks a lot.  
9 I really appreciate it.

10 MS. STONE: Okay. Thank you very much. David  
11 Ring? David Ring? Oh, that's you. Hi. Welcome back.

12 MR. RING: It's my turn. I don't want to bust  
13 anybody's ear drum. I get a kick out of all the  
14 opposition that I've heard here today, but let me tell  
15 you, I'm an optimist. I think that's the reason I came  
16 to Alaska a lot of years ago being, an optimist. And  
17 what I think is I smell opportunity. And I smell it big  
18 size.

19 Now, it's going -- the bridge is going to do  
20 something for somebody. And I think it's going to take a  
21 little pressure off. We don't have to move further up  
22 the hillside to build homes. We don't have to put up a  
23 high-rise six, seven, eight stories high if we've got  
24 some land somewhere to build on. Okay. So I'd like to  
25 look at this thing again, like what opportunity does it

1 present?

2                   And as far as cost of the bridge is concerned,  
3 I don't care what figure you want to use, whether you  
4 like one billion, two or three, I'd say there's plenty of  
5 land on that far side over there and it's state owned.  
6 If you put up that land for sale after the bridge is  
7 there, my bet is that it's going to wipe out the entire  
8 cost of that bridge. You want a bridge for free? I love  
9 it. I think that if you sell enough land over there then  
10 you've got a free bridge. I bet somebody ought to love  
11 that. I would like to hear this opposition address that.  
12 Have you heard enough from me.

13                   SPEAKERS: More.

14                   MR. RING: More?

15                   MS. STONE: You have about 30 seconds.

16                   MR. RING: I have 30 seconds. I think it's  
17 time enough for me to drop a breath and give you a break.

18                   MS. STONE: Lois Epstein and then Andre Camara  
19 and Margaret Winnacker.

20                   MS. EPSTEIN: Good evening. I'm an engineer  
21 with Cook Inlet Keeper here in Anchorage. I live  
22 downtown. And just a quick response to what we just  
23 heard is that as an engineer that land is awful wet and  
24 it's not going to be worth as much as we all anticipate  
25 in terms of building that bridge. It's not going to be

1       valuable.

2                   We're a watershed protection organization and  
3 we have members throughout the Cook Inlet watershed and  
4 elsewhere, both sides of the bridge obviously. Our work  
5 promotes vibrant and economically healthy communities and  
6 healthy wildlife populations.

7                   I'm going to speak to some specific comments.  
8 I have some general comments that I think I'll run out of  
9 time and so maybe I can provide those later or in  
10 writing.

11                   Cook Inlet keeper questions the need and  
12 purpose of the proposed project at this point in time.  
13 Based on the population projections we've seen, it's  
14 possible that the actual need for the bridge may not  
15 exist for decades. Population projections for the entire  
16 Mat-Su Borough were contained in KABATA's public  
17 materials. And they can be used in isolation because the  
18 bridge is only going to serve a portion of the borough.

19                   Second, there's no evidence of a military need  
20 for the bridge. So I'm responding to one of the needs  
21 that has been raised. Third, with respect to emergency  
22 response and disaster evacuation, Anchorage currently has  
23 multiple points of entry and exit, and bridges will  
24 likely be very vulnerable to transit problems.

25                   Fourth, there currently is no reason to connect

1 Port MacKenzie and the Port of Anchorage, even though  
2 that has been also expressed as a need.

3 As for scoping, Cook Inlet Keeper believes the  
4 project's environmental impact statement needs to look at  
5 all costs and impacts of the bridge, including the cost  
6 of infrastructure development, such as schools that will  
7 only be needed because of the proposed bridge.

8 Alternatives that need to be looked at are  
9 ferry and rail crossings across Knik Arm. Maybe using  
10 Seattle's ferry system as a model that many people are  
11 familiar with here.

12 As for questions, Cook Inlet Keeper is  
13 interested in learning how many times more possibly this  
14 bridge is going to be compared to similar length bridges  
15 in the Lower 48, taking into account bridge design and  
16 construction which must address earthquakes, unusually  
17 high tides, silt, boulders, ice, and vulnerable wildlife.

18 Is the proposed Knik Arm bridge three times  
19 more possible than some other bridge? Five times? Ten  
20 times? I don't think we know. And as an engineer, I  
21 think that's a critically important question. It's  
22 important for public policy if we think it's important  
23 for making choices of what to do with our money.

24 You have to do a similar analysis for the  
25 approach of the bridge, because from what I have seen

1 from the schematics, we're talking about putting the  
2 approach on the Anchorage side along a sloughy bluff, and  
3 one that's subject to earthquakes and other forces.

4 A second question I have relates to belugas.  
5 Since this bridge will impact belugas, as will the  
6 planned improvements to the Port of Anchorage and Port  
7 MacKenzie, we'd like to know how the federal government  
8 will address cumulative and synergistic impacts on the  
9 belugas, because this project is the one that it seems to  
10 me, at this point is least needed, perhaps it's the most  
11 dispensable.

12 Third question and then I'll end. Mr. Jordan  
13 said that the cost estimate is based on the use of the  
14 A-C couplet, the 400 to 600 million. My question is  
15 doesn't that presuppose that we're going to be choosing  
16 that and undermine the public process, because at this  
17 point, we don't really know that that's the proper  
18 selection for route and therefore the cost might be  
19 impacted quite a bit higher. So thank you very much.

20 MS. STONE: Would you like an answer to the  
21 cost estimate --

22 MS. EPSTEIN: I would love an answer.

23 MS. STONE: -- presupposition of --

24 MR. JORDAN: We're waiting to select one final  
25 alternate and to cost that. And as I mentioned, we do

1 not know what the final design will be and where it will  
2 come out. And that's why the cost varies from 400 to  
3 600, because there are many variables that still have to  
4 be determined. We picked one that looked like it would  
5 work and costed that just so we have some basis.

6 MS. EPSTEIN: It seems a little disingenuous  
7 for the public to be using that number if the actual cost  
8 would be quite a bit higher.

9 MR. JORDAN: It could be lower as well.

10 MS. STONE: It's a starting point. You like to  
11 be clear -- what it's based on and then what is sure then  
12 that that is not then automatically driving it into that  
13 particular outcome.

14 MS. EPSTEIN: And how about that engineering  
15 question, about how many more times more costly is this  
16 particular bridge than some other bridge.

17 MS. STONE: And I'm wondering why that's  
18 important to you. So we can talk about that. But I'm  
19 curious about, if you have these other conditions, and  
20 therefore it necessitates a more expensive bridge, why  
21 would you compare it to a bridge where it doesn't have  
22 the use?

23 MS. EPSTEIN: As someone who pays taxes to the  
24 federal government, this money is coming to Alaska. I go  
25 to other places as well. And I think it's important in

1 the public policy as to how much should go towards --

2 MS. STONE: As a public policy question about  
3 how much is it worth spending public funds?

4 MS EPSTEIN: Yes.

5 MS. STONE: Does anyone want to speak to  
6 comparative costs with other bridges in the Lower 48.

7 MR. JORDAN: We don't have a design yet.

8 MS. STONE: It hasn't been designed. So it's  
9 something we can't compare to a comparable bridge in  
10 another area.

11 MR. EPSTEIN: Well, there are cost number --  
12 I'm happy to follow-up with someone if they can get back  
13 to me on that.

14 And then the third question was about how do we  
15 deal with the fact that there are three boxes at this  
16 point that are going to affect belugas. There's the  
17 bridge and the two ports. They're all ongoing projects.

18 No federal agency, as far as I know, is --  
19 there's no federal process that's looking at those  
20 cumulatively and synergistically. There is a draft  
21 conservation plan, but that's not a decision making  
22 document on this bridge.

23 MS. STONE: A requirement under NEPA that  
24 cumulative effects be looked at. And that's not the  
25 efforts of any given project to be looked at in isolation

1 from what is going on in the area.

2 Robyn for -- the other Robyn. Do you want to  
3 say something about cumulative impact? The different  
4 concerns about the various activities that would impact  
5 the belugas in particular?

6 MR. SENNER: Thanks, Louise. Yes, this -- EIS  
7 is looking at cumulative effects, indirect and cumulative  
8 effects. And it's really the bottom line of the entire  
9 EIS.

10 In a way, you can say it's the most important  
11 aspect of the EIS because the goal is to try, at least,  
12 using transparent methods to predict what both sides of  
13 the Inlet will look like in the year 2030. And  
14 obviously, we can't do that with any accuracy.

15 But we have to use methods that the public and  
16 the regulatory agencies can understand and follow. And  
17 the belugas will be part of that and everything else will  
18 be part of that, too.

19 We're looking at the physical biological and  
20 social aspects of the environment. And to do that we're  
21 going to select certain indicators, valued environmental  
22 components, and belugas are already selected as one of  
23 those.

24 So the beluga analysis will be definitely part  
25 of the indirect and cumulative process.

1 MS. STONE: And you may want to talk with --  
2 this is Robyn Senner, and talk with him afterwards  
3 further about that. Good. Thank you.

4 Andre Camara and then Martha Winnacker, Paul  
5 Laverty, Douglas Johnson and Eric Gates. And Mark  
6 Butler.

7 MR. CAMARA: Thank you for the opportunity to  
8 provide comments tonight. My name is Andre Camera. And  
9 I'm here to speak as a concerned citizen. I've recently  
10 gotten married and my wife and I are currently in the  
11 market to buy a home here in Anchorage. So we care very  
12 much about having a sustainable economic future.

13 I support doing all the sustainable things that  
14 we possibly can to provide good jobs for all Alaskans  
15 well into the future. I do have many concerns about this  
16 bridge, though. The proposed bridge would connect  
17 Anchorage to hundreds of square miles of unpopulated  
18 wetlands to the north, which raises the concern that this  
19 will further promote sprawl.

20 This raises another fear that property taxes  
21 will go up, house values will go down if cheap land up  
22 there is 15 miles from downtown.

23 This is really contrary to Anchorage's  
24 comprehensive plan, which is based on smart growth  
25 principles that aspire to make Anchorage the kind of

1 place that matches the splendor of our setting.

2 So I ask, how will this proposed bridge impact  
3 the Anchorage comprehensive plan that calls for  
4 containing growth inside the bowl and not spreading it  
5 out further? It will take away population and business  
6 from Anchorage, at a time when voters recently showed  
7 their desire to invest in downtown.

8 Another concern is about the impact the bridge  
9 would have on the marine life, which was identified in a  
10 recent study. The Mat-Su Valley and borough already  
11 struggling with growth on roads and schools is  
12 experiencing a rapid population boom, so it makes more  
13 sense to use our existing infrastructure of railroad  
14 tracks to putting in commuter rail that would ease  
15 traffic congestion on the Glenn Highway.

16 And in wrapping up, as Anchorage prepares for  
17 its long range transportation plan I have to ask, how  
18 many necessary projects would be sacrificed for this  
19 bridge? I think we need to look to more sensible  
20 solutions to solve commuting concerns. Thank you.

21 MS. STONE: Thank you. Martha Winnacker.

22 MS. WINNACKER: My name is Martha Winnacker.  
23 I'm actually an outsider. I'm from the bay area in  
24 California.

25 MS. STONE: You need to speak into the mike.

1 MS. WINNACKER: Oh, wrong mike. I'm sorry.  
2 I'm from California, San Francisco Bay Area and very  
3 familiar with the Golden Gate Bridge. And I'm living on  
4 Government Hill, which is a beautiful community. I --  
5 the thing that struck me more than anything when I saw  
6 the newspaper story that said one of the conceived routes  
7 was going to go right through this lovely neighborhood  
8 was, what an old fashioned idea. This sounds like  
9 California in the 1950s. And when we had an earthquake in  
10 1989, and it broke some of our freeways, we didn't  
11 rebuild them. We took them down and we reclaimed the  
12 waterfront and we have fabulously improved neighborhoods  
13 in a city -- not just a city, a region, that is much more  
14 worthy of the splendid setting than it is.

15 And I see Anchorage in an even more splendid  
16 city. I've never seen a place like this, not taking  
17 advantage of, and not nurturing and not conserving the  
18 splendor of its setting and building a city that  
19 treasures its neighborhoods and makes itself harmonious.  
20 That's all I wanted to say. Thanks.

21 MS. STONE: Thank you. Paul Lavery?

22 MR. LAVERTY: Paul Lavery. Good evening. My  
23 first comment is whoever did the economic estimate, the  
24 cost estimate and the traffic estimate for the Whittier  
25 Tunnel project needs to go back and recalibrate their

1 model .

2 Looking at the EIS, the Whittier Tunnel project  
3 was estimated to cost \$50 million. The actual cost was  
4 upwards of 80 to 90 million dollars. An 80 to 90 percent  
5 cost overrun. The traffic estimates in that EIS also  
6 predicted, that after about two or three years of the  
7 tunnel being open, 656,000 vehicles would pass through  
8 there. Latest count, end of 2004, shows 116,000 vehicles  
9 passing through the tunnel .

10 So, again, if people's estimates are going to  
11 be driving this demand and this need for this bridge,  
12 like I said, whoever did the cost estimate for that  
13 project better calibrate their model, or they're going to  
14 be grossly over estimating the usage of that bridge.

15 Another comment, over on your transportation  
16 planning tool on the board, you have listed under Number  
17 5, Anchorage's land use allocation model. My question  
18 is: Where is the discussion and analysis of the Mat-Su  
19 Borough's plan use plan? Anchorage land use is pretty  
20 well established and fairly predictable. The Mat-Su is  
21 full of open and undeveloped land, and the land over  
22 there will dictate most of the traffic on the bridge  
23 coming into Anchorage.

24 I would also like to see, whenever that  
25 analysis is done, a sensitivity analysis on the predicted

1 Mat-Su Borough land use, that in order -- so we can  
2 guess -- kind of determine the range on and upper and  
3 lower bound as far as projections and a reasonable  
4 alternative over there on how that's going to dictate  
5 these traffic estimate numbers.

6 NEPA analysis requires analysis of  
7 alternatives. Right now the concept map that shows these  
8 various routes, I don't believe those are real variations  
9 in the project. Basically what you have is a bridge  
10 coming down, traveling about a mile through the port,  
11 abutting the hill to Government Hill, and then connecting  
12 to the C Street -- A-C Street couplet. The gap of a  
13 couple hundred yards is what you folks are proposing to  
14 show as three different variations on a project. I feel  
15 that is woefully inadequate as far as an actual  
16 determination on the variations.

17 We need to take a look at a corridor passing  
18 through Elmendorf, connecting further west over to  
19 Muldoon or Boniface like the '84 study looked at.

20 And also, the needs and purpose statement,  
21 that's been dumped on quite a bit. I was at meeting  
22 December 15th of this past year -- at the bridge and toll  
23 authority. An update was given by Mark Vandogen at that  
24 board meeting. Mark is the port director on the Mat-Su  
25 side. And Edrie was at that meeting. And Mark talked

1 about that the Port MacKenzie port specifically designed  
2 not to compete with Anchorage. The Anchorage Port, is a  
3 container port for any traffic coming in. Port MacKenzie  
4 is designed for bulk natural resources going out.

5 Why there needs to be bridge connecting those  
6 two ports is beyond me. I posed that question at the  
7 Anchorage Port Commission today and got no response from  
8 the Anchorage side on why these things -- for them to be  
9 more efficient as a port, they need to be connected to  
10 Port MacKenzie.

11 And one last question and I'll finish up. What  
12 has happened since the spring of 2001, when the  
13 Municipality of Anchorage pushed for an Ingra/Gambell  
14 project to get all those nasty truck traffic out of  
15 downtown Anchorage and over onto Ingra/Gambell. And now,  
16 five years later, this project that's going to be  
17 bringing in traffic from the Mat-Su is -- it's going to  
18 funnel that traffic right through the downtown.

19 So my question is what happened in the past  
20 three or four years, when all of a sudden streets of  
21 downtown are acceptable to not only the additional truck  
22 traffic that's grown over the past four years, but also  
23 this new projected traffic coming in from Mat-Su?

24 MS. STONE: Thank you. So that impact to  
25 downtown in terms of the traffic has been mentioned

1 earlier. And that's something that you are concerned  
2 about as well?

3 MR. LAVERTY: Yes.

4 MS. STONE: Douglas Johnson and then Eric  
5 Gates, then Shao Junjie. Chris Hamre, do you want to  
6 speak? You have a question mark. Oh, is Douglas Johnson  
7 here? And then let's move on to Eric Gates. Eric Gates?  
8 Sean -- oh, are you Eric Gates?

9 MR. GATES. Yes.

10 MS. STONE: Hello.

11 MR. GATES. My name is Eric Gates. First of  
12 all, I'm not from Anchorage. I'm out in the Valley, so  
13 don't hold it against me.

14 First of all, my first concept is the bridge is  
15 a good idea, but I think it's too small. The reason I  
16 say it's too small, because there's been a couple of  
17 people that alluded to the fact there's what, four or  
18 five -- you tell me how many agencies are involved in  
19 this, and how many people have a decision? I'm on the  
20 Mat-Su side and if I come to Anchorage I don't have a say  
21 so on where that end of that bridge goes. You guys do.  
22 And you guys don't have a say so on what happens on the  
23 other side of that bridge. Mat-Su does.

24 I think this needs to be blanketed into a  
25 larger scope where we have a staged traffic connection

1 plan where we connect the Seward Highway, where we  
2 connect the Glenn Highway. Where we take the Parks  
3 Highway and we say, "Okay. What are we going to do with  
4 that?"

5 If we're going to build this bridge, which the  
6 idea is good, I think we're leaving it up to bonds that  
7 happen out in Mat-Su and bonds that happen in here. And  
8 what happens when you're talking about it and all your  
9 agencies are getting together and everybody is shuffling  
10 around trying to get their best foot forward.

11 I think that's a wrong approach to this. I  
12 think it needs to be a state-wide project where the whole  
13 state gets a say so, because when people in Kenai want to  
14 go to Fairbanks they can go through, or somebody over in  
15 the opposite direction. Not everybody using that bridge  
16 is going to go to Anchorage. They're going to go to  
17 Girdwood. They're going to go further south. And why  
18 would they drive all the way around when they're over up  
19 in the west side there?

20 And that's my comments. I just think that as  
21 far as the agencies go, I think it needs to be a broader  
22 agency -- more of a blanket agency on the whole  
23 project, because everybody here has their -- this is the  
24 Anchorage project. And I was at the meeting last night  
25 and just to let you know, it's not a scientific, but

1 90 percent of the people were for it over there. Let's  
2 go, let's go, let's go. But at the same time, where are  
3 we going when we get to the other side of the bridge,  
4 who's controlling that? And that's my comment.

5 MS. STONE: Shao Junjie? Shao Junjie? Chris  
6 Hamre. You have a question mark next to your name. Do  
7 you want to speak. Chris? How about Ron Polk? How  
8 about Leonard Herzog?

9 MR. HERZOG: I live up on Government Hill. So  
10 that's the idea of kind of where I'm coming from. But  
11 what the last speaker said about people from different  
12 parts of the state wanting to travel, the issue is that  
13 people do want to travel. The question is that ends  
14 up -- if they don't want to go to downtown, or don't want  
15 to go to Government Hill, you know, traveling through our  
16 neighborhood.

17 I think that we need more detail on the access.  
18 It's important to know whether you want to put a tunnel  
19 through, or whether you want to put a six-lane highway  
20 through, or do you want to put an elevated highway  
21 through where people can determine, you know, what  
22 exactly the effects on the neighborhood.

23 You know, looking at your maps, you know, one  
24 idea, you know, you show a little line going through  
25 around the bluff, but in the next picture you show an

1 elevated highway, you know, connected to it. Similarly  
2 on the crossing that goes right through town, you know,  
3 at one time, there was an idea of a highway coming right  
4 through a two-lane road. And then you have a model that  
5 kind of shows a tunnel, but it's too narrow, you know, to  
6 fit through.

7           So I think before we talk about access, we need  
8 more information because living on the Hill, we don't  
9 know exactly what the impacts are going to be. And I'm  
10 concerned that they'll build the -- spend the money on  
11 the bridge, and then in the end, we won't have any money  
12 left and we're just going to end up throwing a six-lane  
13 highway right through the middle of town.

14           MS. STONE: You need more information.  
15 Specifically what information --

16           MR. HENRY: Specifically, whether you intend to  
17 go across through the Hill? Whether you want to build an  
18 elevated highway through the Hill? Whether you want --  
19 you know, what exactly is going to come through because  
20 when we just see shaded areas -- you know, like I live on  
21 the Bluff. It's a big difference to put an evaluated  
22 highway and cut, you know, 20 feet behind my house, or if  
23 you're going to put a park you don't want a tunnel  
24 through.

25           The other thing, federal money is great. But

1 look at the last big project we had in town that I think  
2 is completely worthless, the railroad that goes to the  
3 airport for just Seward cruise passengers. You know, if  
4 we're going to use federal monies, let's go ahead and  
5 spend them for needs that people have. Because I'm  
6 afraid that the only benefits this project has is to real  
7 estate investors on the other side of the water. No one  
8 lives there now. No one needs to live there. So let's  
9 talk about aiding the people that live in Anchorage and  
10 aiding the people that live in Mat-Su. Thank you.

11 MS. STONE: First of all, I want to make sure  
12 I'm pronouncing it. You're Leonard Henry?

13 MR. HERZOG: First of all, it's H-E-R-Z-O-G.

14 MS. STONE: I'm so glad you clarified that, so  
15 we can get that correct. Leonard Herzog. Thank you.  
16 Neal Fried, do you want to speak? Let's see. We're up  
17 to Jane Angvik, and then Ed Hanson, Carl London and  
18 Thomas Pease.

19 MS. ANGVIK: Good afternoon. Thank you for the  
20 opportunity to speak. My name is Jane Angvik. And I  
21 live here in Anchorage. And I have the pleasure of  
22 owning property on both sides of this piece of water.  
23 And as a result, I have some concerns about the purpose  
24 and needs statements. Others have mentioned it earlier,  
25 but I'm very concerned about what connectivity we're

1 addressi ng.

2 The purpose and needs statement indicated we  
3 want to connect the Anchorage Port to the Mat-Su Port and  
4 other persons have previously spoken about linking a  
5 containerized port with a natural resources port. And I  
6 think that the EIS should address what it is we're trying  
7 to connect between those two facilities.

8 Additionally, I'm concerned about the  
9 connectivity between the population centers, in that the  
10 current population center of Mat-Su is in the Wasilla  
11 area, and they would be equal distance from Anchorage by  
12 way of the bridge as they would be by way of the road.

13 So I'm concerned about what we are connecting.  
14 And it's still 42 miles either way. So Wasilla certainly  
15 isn't getting any closer to Anchorage, and Anchorage is  
16 not going to get any closer to Nancy Lake.

17 I'm also concerned about the issue of -- and I  
18 would like the EIS to address the question of the  
19 competition of transportation dollars. And if I  
20 understand correctly, ma'am, you're the person who  
21 manages the federal highway dollars that will be coming  
22 in on this project.

23 MS. VISON: I don't manage the dollars. I  
24 manage the NEPA project.

25 MS. ANGVIK: Okay. I would just like to say

1 that the cost issue that I'm concerned about is that if  
2 we -- let's assume we have 600 million dollars to spend.  
3 Is this the highest transportation need that should be  
4 address in the upper Cook Inlet region as expressed by  
5 the needs statement?

6 The materials that were handed out indicated  
7 that the Knik Arm crossing project doesn't believe  
8 there's competition for other transportation dollars with  
9 respect to this. But I would like the EIS to address how  
10 the utilization of these dollars might affect  
11 opportunities associated with other transportation needs  
12 both in Anchorage and in the Mat-Su.

13 I'm also concerned about connectivity as stated  
14 in the needs statement, because if the bridge does not  
15 have rail access, the one connecting link for Alaska is  
16 missing from this enhanced connectivity.

17 And, so, I believe that the -- if we're really  
18 moving freight around, that we need to be able to put  
19 rail on the bridge. And I believe that there's some kind  
20 of economic consequence for the cost of the bridge by  
21 doing that.

22 Finally, I would like to say that I'm very  
23 concerned about regional land use planning, and the  
24 changes -- the differences between lack of land use  
25 planning on the Mat-Su side, and the considerable effort

1 that has been put into land use planning on the Anchorage  
2 side, and hoping that there will be some way that there  
3 could be another additional linkage between there, and  
4 other persons have already addressed it.

5 Finally, I would like to make sure that when  
6 we're thinking about this, that we're really talking  
7 about our regional perspective, and that the previous  
8 speaker had indicated linking the Seward Highway to the  
9 Glenn Highway, that that would actually affect the  
10 regional connectivity of this area, is what we should be  
11 looking at. And it shouldn't be going on between the A-C  
12 couplet, the already congested Port of Anchorage, but  
13 some place further north. Thank you.

14 MS. STONE: Ed Hansen. You have a question  
15 mark on your name. Would you like to speak?

16 MR. HANSEN: Sure.

17 MS. STONE: Okay. And then Carl London, and  
18 then Thomas Pease, at which point we will have finished  
19 our list. So if the audience would like to speak,  
20 shortly you will be able to.

21 MR. HANSEN: Good evening. My name is Ed  
22 Hansen. I came to Anchorage, Alaska December the 20th  
23 1946. So I've been around for a while. And I've spent  
24 my life in business and finance. I was a banker for  
25 25 odd years and still active. I notice that the older

1 guys tonight are the optimist and the younger guys are  
2 the conservatists.

3 So I guess that speaks well for guys who have  
4 gone through business cycles up here, feel like the  
5 jagged edge of a saw blade. But we know one thing, that  
6 we have to survive on the extract of industry, therefore,  
7 we have to rely a lot upon the unrenewable resources.

8 We are confronted continuously with more and  
9 more government regulation. We're losing ground to the  
10 feds. We're losing ground to the Native Corporations in  
11 terms of what we can do with what's left to be -- yet to  
12 be done.

13 We know that Alaska -- Anchorage has a choke  
14 hold that sort -- it sort of put itself in that position  
15 in a lot of ways. As an example, most cities in the  
16 United States have parks, recreation facilities and  
17 greenbelts and that sort of thing that run towards 7  
18 percent of the total land mass.

19 As of about five years ago, I think our parks  
20 and recreation and greenbelts, creeks and so forth and so  
21 on run about 24 percent of the land mass. So we put a  
22 choke hold on what we have left in this Valley, in this  
23 basin.

24 And, also, we love the military. They're an  
25 important part of our economic resource in this area.

1 And yet they have an enormous strip of land that extends  
2 southward from Eagle River and clear to Potter, and  
3 really they've gotten almost that far. But whatever it  
4 is, they've got a chunk that maybe, you know, if we just  
5 had that piece we probably wouldn't be having this  
6 meeting. But it is an important consideration.

7 We don't really want to build 24 flights of  
8 stairs to go home at night. We would like to be -- like  
9 to have our citizens in the single-family dwellings  
10 certainly as much as possible was. But we've reached the  
11 point where we have to consider using what land is left  
12 in this basin for multiple housing. It makes a lot of us  
13 very unhappy.

14 I look across that Inlet. I see there's a mile  
15 away. There's some freedom out there. The ground may be  
16 wet, but it's no wetter than what we dug out of the Old  
17 Seward Highway last year. It seems to me it went down  
18 about 30 feet in some places. They had to rebuild the  
19 thing. And we're not going to find much different  
20 geology on the other side, but we've got to remember, it  
21 was part of this neighborhood at one time.

22 So it's nothing new to us. And there's nothing  
23 new to real Alaskans who know that in one respect we've  
24 kind of lived off our mistakes. You know, we do it over  
25 again sometimes. And that produces -- since labor seems

1 to run about 60 percent of whatever we do, if we make a  
2 mistake and do it over again, we've just increased the  
3 gross income of the community, haven't we?

4 MS. STONE: And, so, if you can wrap up and  
5 make your final point, please.

6 MR. HANSEN: My point is that I think there's a  
7 notable absence of optimists tonight. I think they're  
8 going to go home all too confident of what others  
9 might think. I think if you're in favor of the project,  
10 you ought to be speaking up and be definitely a  
11 participant.

12 I want to be a participant in this planning.  
13 And I'm here tonight to sign something if I could. Thank  
14 you very much.

15 MS. STONE: Thank you. Carl London. Carl  
16 London and Thomas Pease.

17 MR. LONDON: Carl London is the name. I'm a  
18 taxpayer here in this borough. I've heard some comments  
19 from some people who really have solicitations for money,  
20 I guess you could say. So I have no interest in  
21 furthering my own personal cause. I am solely interested  
22 in what is best for the economic development for the  
23 area.

24 To me, bridge is a wrong concept. I think we  
25 should be considering a dam with about four lanes, two

1 going each way. Plus a railroad track across. We're  
2 going to need some fresh water before long. We've got  
3 plenty of it right now, but on down the road, water will  
4 be a requirement. So we can actually do that. We would  
5 be on the conservation side, we could stop a lot of  
6 erosion to our bluffs, particularly on the west side, by  
7 having a steady flow of water level instead of this  
8 erratic fluctuations with the tides.

9 The economic impact would be -- we don't really  
10 need Palmer and Wasilla for this consideration. That is  
11 old stuff. Our new population center will be right  
12 across the Inlet. We've got to have also a way to get to  
13 our new capitol on up the road a few feet.

14 So let's start thinking positive instead of our  
15 negative. We can't do this in my backyard. I say we  
16 need to move across the Inlet and put it in our front  
17 yard.

18 And as far as our taxes go, we have  
19 governments, one after the other it seems, in this  
20 borough, that have no control over their physical  
21 accountability. It's always increase, increase your  
22 taxes. So they have no one really to be accountable for.  
23 Competition will provide that. Whenever their base is  
24 moved elsewhere, then you better bet they'll start  
25 looking at their bottom lines. Thank you.

1 MS. STONE: Thomas Pease.

2 MR. PEASE: Good evening, and thank you for the  
3 opportunity to speak. Most of my comments will be put in  
4 the form of questions because I have a lot of them.

5 First of all, why is the northern access route  
6 not shown on the map? Nor is it not listed as one of the  
7 three preferred options considering this is the scoping  
8 stage of the process right now.

9 MS. STONE: So, Thomas, you have a list of  
10 questions. Are these questions you just want to be noted  
11 so that this group will attend to these things, that you  
12 want to make sure they're addressed, or are these  
13 questions that you want answers to tonight? Or maybe you  
14 can tell us, if there's any one you want an answer to  
15 tonight as opposed to just having it noted --

16 MR. PEASE: I'd just like to go ahead.

17 MS. STONE: Okay. If there's any you want an  
18 answer to tonight, let us know.

19 MR. PEASE: So why are the northern access  
20 routes not shown on the map, considering this is supposed  
21 to be the beginning of the planning process?

22 Also, why is the northern access route not  
23 shown on the maps, considering it was listed as the  
24 preferred route in the Knik Arm Bridge study that was  
25 performed in 1984? Federal Highway Administration

1 process guidelines mandate that all route alternatives be  
2 considered in the scoping process. Certainly the most  
3 preferred and least disruptive routes should appear  
4 alongside the least desirable routes.

5 Second, the purpose and needs statements,  
6 according to Federal Highway Administration guidelines,  
7 are required to be based on thorough research and  
8 compelling data. Yet no such studies or data have been  
9 shared with the public. In fact, when asked at a meeting  
10 last week from what process the purpose and need  
11 statements arose, we were told simply that they were  
12 written by KABATA. One stated need is for public safety  
13 and emergency access. But where's the data? Has FEMA or  
14 local emergency responders expressed a dire need for this  
15 bridge?

16 Likewise, has the military come to KABATA  
17 saying that the bridge project is a required component of  
18 Homeland Security? Or is this stated need just another  
19 example of using public safety to promote a project?

20 Another stated need is to connect the community  
21 of Anchorage and the rapidly expanding Mat-Su,  
22 specifically to accommodate commuter traffic. Continued  
23 growth in Mat-Su is indisputable, but population increase  
24 may not translate into equal increases in commuter trips  
25 to and from Anchorage.

1                   As a community grows, and reaches a critical  
2 threshold and develops its own infrastructure, more  
3 stores, more schools, hospitals, et cetera, which create  
4 local jobs, a stable economy, and less commuter traffic.  
5 Projected growth and projected commuter traffic cannot be  
6 directly correlated. Again, where's the data?

7                   Third, in last Sunday's paper, "The Anchorage  
8 Daily News" outlined the plans for the Fairview  
9 expressway, a \$575 million project designed to  
10 accommodate daily -- accommodate daily tens of thousands  
11 of additional commuter trips to Mat-Su.

12                   How is the Knik Arm crossing project being  
13 coordinated with the Fairview expressway? Are both  
14 projects needed? Construction of one project could  
15 reduce, change or even eliminate the need for the other  
16 projects.

17                   What coordination and studies have been done to  
18 consider how the needs of the Knik Arm project may change  
19 or diminish with the completion of the Fairview  
20 expressway? Thank you.

21                   MS. STONE: So that ends my list of people who  
22 signed up to speak. I'm wondering how many others would  
23 like to say something. So I'm seeing a few hands. I  
24 want to know. They're probably at least half a dozen of  
25 you, maybe a little more, who want to speak. What I

1 would like to do is -- it's now 7:30. We've been at this  
2 for a couple of hours, and we'd like to make sure you  
3 have a chance to speak, which I'm going to ask you to  
4 speak and be succinct, so that we can incorporate you,  
5 but also give people a chance to get out of their chairs  
6 pretty soon. I saw your hand first. Come on down. And  
7 please state your name, please.

8 MR. HOLT: Sure. Yeah, my name is Randy Holt.  
9 First of all, when was the first study for the Knik  
10 bridge? Was it back in 1930s?

11 MR. JORDAN: 1955.

12 MR. HOLT: Okay. Thank you. Those that  
13 suggest that the Mat-Su residents leave their cars either  
14 in a ferry terminal or a train terminal, you know, and  
15 then go ahead and take you to the ferry or the train into  
16 Anchorage, and then get dropped off in Anchorage, and  
17 then either use the bus or some other form of mass  
18 transit, I'd like to see them just once leave their car  
19 at home. Okay?

20 You know, most of the people wants everybody  
21 else to do something else, has major plans for other  
22 people to do it, but just not me. Okay? So go ahead and  
23 leave their car at home for a week -- maybe a week at a  
24 time, then there wouldn't be as much traffic.

25 But when I have to drive from the Mat-Su Valley

1 into Anchorage, it is a bummer. Hey, I live in Wasilla.  
2 The bridge isn't going to help me a lot. But the people  
3 from up north, it is going to help quite a heck of a bit.  
4 And, then, also a lot of people are looking at  
5 this bridge as it's a tunnel that they can't escape from.  
6 Oh my God. I'm on the bridge. I can't get out. But  
7 it's going to open up -- not only is it going to open at  
8 the Mat-Su Valley, it will open up further north. Okay.  
9 And the one person was talking about how long it was  
10 going to stop just in Anchorage. All we're talking about  
11 is a bridge trying to connect two places. The roads  
12 aren't going to stop. They're not going to put a gate up  
13 and say, "Well, once you get off the bridge it's done.  
14 No more driving."  
15 You know, peoples' concepts are just mind  
16 boggling. They say, "Oh my God. We've got a bridge. We  
17 get off." So that's my one thing.  
18 And, hey, this is an opportunity that we can go  
19 ahead and open up the northern part and, you know, people  
20 can get both. From the northern part there's a lot of  
21 recreation up north. And every fishing season I see a  
22 lot Anchorage residents that are up there king fishing.  
23 And I'm sure that they're going to be next year and the  
24 following years, too. We enjoy it. Okay? Let's go with  
25 the bridge.

1 MR. ADAMS: I know there's a lot of opposition.  
2 I'm 100 percent for it.

3 MS. STONE: Can you state your name?

4 MR. ADAMS: Virgil A. Adams. And this person  
5 over here, which is the only opposition that I thought  
6 was well valid because it leads to -- she is talking  
7 about her work. She has her -- she's protecting her line  
8 of involvement, which is fine.

9 MS. STONE: Sir, could you speak on your own  
10 point of view?

11 MR. ADAMS: My own point of view is it's work  
12 for me. I think it's a lot of money for the economy of  
13 Anchorage and this state of Alaska and the Valley and  
14 North of the Valley. I'm 100 hundred percent for it.  
15 The environmentalist, they're veering off the subject.  
16 They're always --

17 MS. STONE: If we could just have you speak  
18 from your point of view, not their point of view.

19 MR. ADAMS: Well, I'm not an environmentalist.  
20 Not at all.

21 MS. STONE: So tell us what you think.

22 MR. ADAMS: I think we can do it. We've got  
23 the EIS. And I'm sure the environmentalists know exactly  
24 what that is. I mean, they're sitting there watching it,  
25 and they're doing all the statements, and they're doing

1 all the studies. I don't see why they're sitting there  
2 going to fight it. There's going to be people that are  
3 extreme environmentalists fighting us all the way. And I  
4 think we need to pay less attention to them, because I  
5 don't see where they're coming from.

6 They're making their own way about it. And a  
7 lot of people say we don't have the money for the  
8 infrastructure on either side after we build it. Hey,  
9 we'll get the federal money after we build it.

10 COLONEL TORRES: Hello. My name is Colonel Joe  
11 Torres. I'm the chief of staff for Alaska Command.  
12 That's the senior military command in Alaska. We're  
13 actually stationed on Elmendorf Air Force Base. I work  
14 very closely with the 3rd Wing at Elmendorf Air Force  
15 Base and also the United States Army of Alaska at Fort  
16 Richardson.

17 We've all signed up -- those three  
18 organizations have signed up to be cooperating agencies  
19 in this endeavor. We are partners. We're your  
20 neighbors. We are going to provide all of the analysis  
21 and anything that's asked of us to provide as  
22 alternatives, and, that is, all alternatives are  
23 presented to us. And I just want to be sure that  
24 everyone understands that as an alternative is presented  
25 to us, we will analyze it, and we will provide our

1 feedback to HDR and also to the KABDA Agency.

2 So there are no alternatives that are off the  
3 table at this time. Everything is on the table as  
4 presented to us and we're just waiting, and we're a  
5 cooperating agency and we will continue to work with  
6 everybody because we want to be good partners. We love  
7 Anchorage. We love the community and we're part of the  
8 community.

9 The second thing addresses the need statement.  
10 And there were a couple people that addressed that. Yes,  
11 and we had told this, in our agency meetings, to the  
12 contractors and also KABDA. And they have changed their  
13 need statement. And the draft need statement -- because  
14 I reviewed that, and yesterday they actually went over  
15 that in the meeting out in the Mat-Su Valley.

16 But the need statement that is currently there  
17 does not state that the military needs that for  
18 deployment or strategic. There are no existing limiting  
19 factors or mission shortfalls that the bridge can fix.  
20 We don't have -- we haven't identified any of those.

21 We've told that. They've modified that need  
22 statement. So I believe the current one that's up there,  
23 that has "draft", is the one that was presented yesterday  
24 and it doesn't have that right there. So I just want to  
25 clarify that. Thank you.

1                   MR. SUMNER: I'm Joe Sumner. And I'd like to  
2 address the question of what's going to happen once this  
3 bridge is in place and we have an earthquake. That  
4 hasn't been addressed yet at all. And it really bothers  
5 me because they -- in their diagrams over there they  
6 don't show where the bottom of that silt is.

7                   Now that's bootlegger's clay that created  
8 Earthquake Park and a whole change in forestry and a lot  
9 of other things that occurred. I'd like to make sure  
10 that we not only take a look at this from an engineering  
11 point of view from a computer, but if you're going to  
12 build this thing, put some piling out in the middle of  
13 the Inlet right now, in one span of bridge, and see what  
14 happens to it in the next four or five years when you're  
15 trying to figure this out. And get some data with some  
16 real good instruments to detect what's happening with it.

17                   We can do a lot with theory, but we need to  
18 take a look at what happens with reality. And I think  
19 that would be a very good investment of my money as far  
20 as someone who is paying for part of this project.

21                   The other thing I would like you to look at is  
22 what happens when you start trying to stop the erosion of  
23 that sea wall. I fish down off the Kenai. I've watched  
24 in one single tide, 5 foot of a 100 foot sea wall go  
25 away. Okay? I've also seen a house that was a \$400,000

1 home that they tried to put a sea wall around to protect  
2 it. And after creating quite a peninsula they finally  
3 gave up and lost the house.

4 So you need to take a good look at these things  
5 in reality. Mother Nature is kind of a little old lady,  
6 but boy, she sure beats the devil out of me enough to  
7 know you've got to really find out what's happening in  
8 reality. Thank you.

9 MR. BELL: My name is Greg Bell, I was born and  
10 raised here in Anchorage. Anyway, I'm glad I was here  
11 tonight. Some of the attitude is we wouldn't be here  
12 tonight if we were voting to buy Alaska. A lot of folks  
13 were against that, too. But we did, and we're all here  
14 and we're all glad they did.

15 We've had some great projects in this state in  
16 the last 100 years. And I don't think too many people  
17 want to take them away. The Alaska Railroad, a big  
18 project from Seward to Fairbanks. I think if we tried to  
19 build it today it probably wouldn't happen. And the  
20 Trans-Alaska Pipeline barely happened but we're all  
21 benefiting from it.

22 You know, Anchorage has grown over the years.  
23 And, you know, a lot of folks have benefited from it,  
24 including myself. And we need to keep growing, or else,  
25 you know, if you quit growing you start dying.

1                   You know, I think we should build a bridge and  
2 and keep going on the west side of Cook Inlet and give an  
3 opportunity for some of our new people coming in, younger  
4 people, open some countryside, so you don't have to drive  
5 an hour just to see, you know, an open field or  
6 whatever, like we do right -- you know, if you want to go  
7 out to the Mat Valley, you know, it's an hour away.

8                   The Alaska Highway was another great project  
9 that we have done. You know, because of World War II,  
10 that's another one that probably wouldn't happen today.  
11 If we tried to do some great project it would be a real  
12 difficult thing, but we're all glad it's here because a  
13 lot of us have used it, and it opened up a lot of country  
14 that we're able to see and enjoy.

15                   Right now we have one route into Anchorage and  
16 one route out. And this will give us an alternative to  
17 that. And I think that's extremely important. As far as  
18 an earthquake, I've been through one of those. And all  
19 of Anchorage is built on that blue clay. Some of the  
20 gravel is a little deeper than the others.

21                   I grew up right downtown. The fault line was  
22 half a block away. We didn't fall into the Inlet, but it  
23 was a -- you don't know where that's going to happen.  
24 That doesn't mean you quit doing everything just because  
25 you think something may happen.

1                   And as far as one other thing, a gentleman made  
2 a comment about building a stand off in the middle of the  
3 Inlet. Well, I think that's been done with a dock over  
4 at Point MacKenzie. It's about 1,200 feet out there  
5 already from the tideland there. And, you know, we have  
6 a chance to watch that for a few years and see what  
7 happens. Thank you.

8                   MR. FISH: Hi. My name is Mark Fish. I've  
9 heard a lot of people address the purpose and needs, and  
10 what's the purpose and need. Well, plainly, it's  
11 population growth. When I moved up here I remember  
12 reading the sign, "Welcome to Eagle River. Population  
13 50." Now, I'm not that old. And I can see that it's not  
14 going to end with this generation. It's going to  
15 continue. Now we can either plan for it and build it now  
16 and ask yourself what this same bridge would have cost 20  
17 years ago and then what it's going to cost 20 years from  
18 now.

19                   So I'd say that, yes, let's build it. Let's  
20 try to do it right. I would like to see it interconnect  
21 with the Ingra/Gambell interface and tie in with a direct  
22 route in and out of Anchorage with that, giving basically  
23 a three-way split. With access off and on we can  
24 preserve most of what our neighborhoods need. And at the  
25 same time allow the rest of the state and Anchorage, you

1 know, better access in cases of disasters and  
2 emergencies.

3 That is a problem, you know. They jokingly say  
4 it sometimes, but I've heard some relatives in the Mat-Su  
5 say that if there's anything happening bad in Anchorage,  
6 the first thing they're going to do is blow the bridge.  
7 Well, you know, we need a couple more bridges. That's  
8 all I've got to say.

9 MR. BOMAR: Hi. My name is Bill Bomar. I live  
10 just down the street here. I have mostly questions and  
11 just to be noted. Somebody mentioned a dam and everybody  
12 thought it was kind of far out. But the -- first I read  
13 that first study from 1955 that the Chamber of Commerce  
14 did, and that was actually from an engineer from Seattle.  
15 And that was his first idea was that we ought to take  
16 hydroelectric off this Inlet. There's plenty of -- it's  
17 supposed to be about 8 knot average when it's moving.

18 And the -- it looks like we are running out of  
19 natural gas in Cook Inlet. And I don't know how worried  
20 people are that we might not have any energy, but I would  
21 think the environmentalists would be all over a project  
22 like this because we quite possibly could power the  
23 whole city from that and not have to burn all this  
24 natural gas from down the street here.

25 Maybe people think it sounds whacko, but I

1 think it would work. I was reading the study article  
2 about the Nova Scotia causeway. It's not a bridge. It's  
3 a causeway. I guess you call it that because there's not  
4 a whole lot of water flowing underneath it. And it's  
5 built out of earth. It's about the same length. It's  
6 about the same depth. It's about 13 or 15 million yards  
7 of earth, a third of which is rip rack rock. I think we  
8 need a bridge someplace there, a span where boats and  
9 salmon and belugas can get through.

10 But I think there's a whole lot of smart people  
11 in this room. I'm not necessarily one of them, but I see  
12 a lot of engineers. And I know that this could be  
13 figured out. Some people have said, "oh, if you put  
14 turbines in that silty water it won't work, but I've run  
15 jet -- outboard jet in that silty water a lot and it  
16 works just fine. So I know it would work the other way  
17 around.

18 Another question I have to be noted is that a  
19 lot of these questions are just because I probably missed  
20 the point somewhere along the line. But why aren't we  
21 crossing at the narrowest point, right straight from  
22 Karen Port, straight across? You know, it looks like  
23 we've added a half a mile to this bridge just because we  
24 went past Point MacKenzie and because we went past Karen  
25 Point. If I was building a bridge I'd definitely go for

1 the shortest spot. "The Daily News" said something about  
2 it was too deep. It was almost 200-feet deep at the  
3 shortest spot. Well, that's the same depth as the one in  
4 Nova Scotia. That's the same depth as they were figuring  
5 on that 1955 Chamber of Commerce study that was 15  
6 million yards. That's it.

7 MS. STONE: Is there anyone else here that  
8 wanted to speak? Come on up.

9 MS. DAVIES: Sharon Davies. And I live south  
10 of downtown. And I was a little late coming in tonight,  
11 but the main thing I was looking for was specific data to  
12 back up the supposed needs, and also specific data about  
13 economic projections and, in particular, projections of  
14 the maintenance cost and where the money was going to  
15 come from to pay that maintenance. And I'd like to see a  
16 comparison of the cost per trip of, you know, even the  
17 projected traffic -- and we don't really know what it  
18 will be in the long run -- but the cost project versus  
19 the maintenance cost per trip for the highways that we  
20 already have.

21 It seems to me that solid information like that  
22 needs to be out there before this thing happens. And  
23 then in response to what a couple of men have just said  
24 prior to me, one man said well, maybe the pipeline never  
25 would have gotten built. Well, the pipeline was built

1 because it made economic sense. And I'm questioning  
2 whether this bridge does.

3 And then what was the other thing? If I can  
4 read my notes here. Oh, yes, how much would the bridge  
5 have cost many years ago, or how much would it could cost  
6 in the future. You know, that is really only relevant if  
7 its cost goes up more than inflation in general, and the  
8 state's economy in general. And I doubt the whole thing,  
9 but that's all I have to say.

10 MR. PEAVY: Good evening. My name is Gerald  
11 Peavy. I was born and raised right here in Anchorage.  
12 And I represent four generations of people on the  
13 Government Hill -- my family.

14 I've got no problem with the bridge. I think  
15 progress is great. I do think that they need to give us  
16 more than just three possible routes. And my question  
17 is, is the alternative route, you know, why isn't it, you  
18 know, displayed as a possibility?

19 Don't spilt up Government Hill. Don't divide  
20 it. Don't mess with it. Bypass it. I'm all for saving  
21 belugas and I ate my share of them, too, see. But I've  
22 got an uncle that ate about 50 percent of the migrating  
23 herd right here in Cook Inlet. But, you know, we've got  
24 other needs.

25 I think one point is a railroad across that

1 same bridge would be nice. But I also remember when  
2 Arthur Clark Junior High School came into existence. I  
3 went there in 1960. That school was built at a cost of  
4 three million dollars. When a dollar was really worth a  
5 dollar. And I've got a little bit of trouble thinking  
6 that this bridge is going to be complete and brought in  
7 at 400 to 600 million.

8 And besides that, there's the risk of  
9 Elmendorf, the approach, you know, national security. I  
10 don't think that should be compromised.

11 But it would be my proposition that the bridge,  
12 if it's feasible at all, it would connect over -- farther  
13 over that way in a northern route by Boniface. They  
14 could leave their forest right where they are, because,  
15 you know, you take three small -- whatever neutrons bombs  
16 or something they've got now, you got the bridge, you've  
17 got the tank farm, and you've got the air strip right  
18 there. There's too much of a thing -- and somebody who  
19 does that, who's paying for that, you know.

20 That's my point. Don't move me off Government  
21 Hill. That's my gripe, you know. I'm real. I'm human.  
22 I'm paying my taxes. I'm paying a premium price to live  
23 there. That's about all I've got to say. You know, when  
24 you're considering these animals and stuff, remember my  
25 family, too.

1 MS. STONE: You said you wanted the last word.  
2 Okay. Is there anyone else that wants to speak?

3 MR. BRANDT: Thank you for the opportunity to  
4 speak. My name is Gary Brandt. And I'm kind of in a  
5 position of both being for the bridge and against the  
6 bridge. I haven't heard that one yet tonight. So I  
7 figured I would throw that in.

8 I have actually been in Anchorage 30 years.  
9 And I think all of us that are taxpayers here in  
10 Anchorage realize that we are out of buildable property.  
11 I've heard that come up a number of times tonight. And I  
12 think with that bridge in place we're going to see  
13 diminution in values of the Anchorage area, but not to  
14 the extent that I have been hearing tonight. I believe  
15 it will help everybody on the tax rolls as far as the  
16 property taxes are concerned.

17 The reason why I might be against this bridge  
18 is it happens that the way that they've got it drawn up  
19 right now I'm affected on both ends. It runs right  
20 directly onto my property in Government Hill it knocks it  
21 out and it lands on the other end of a home, on Point  
22 MacKenzie that I have a home on. It isn't landing on the  
23 home, but it's very close to a lake that I own a home on,  
24 and that's going to be directly affected by the traffic  
25 that will be set up out there.

1                   But basically, my concerns tonight, and what  
2 I'm hearing tonight is I am an optimist, even though it  
3 will cause problems for me personally, but the greater  
4 good is more important. And I think Anchorage is --  
5 would benefit greatly from this bridge. So I am pro for  
6 the bridge on that front.

7                   And if you think there's just water on the  
8 other side or just wetland over there, you're wrong. I  
9 go there four days a week, three days a week anyway, and  
10 it's not just wetland. And they are building like mad  
11 down at Point MacKenzie and down Knik Goose Bay because  
12 that's going to bring all of the people in Wasilla that  
13 want to commute are going to use that bridge. It will be  
14 used big time. Thank you.

15                  MR. SYREN: Yes, my name is Tim Syren. I own a  
16 home here in Anchorage and I also own a property at Point  
17 MacKenzie. I am for this bridge 100 percent. I don't  
18 want it to go through Government Hill. I think  
19 Government Hill is a great community and it needs to stay  
20 like it is. After hearing this gentleman from the  
21 military about them wanting to work with us on it, it is  
22 a great thing to hear.

23                  And, you know, the military has really helped  
24 Anchorage throughout the years. And I hope we can work  
25 together or work something out that will work for

1 everybody. And who know, it could become a barrier for  
2 the military, rather than just a 6-foot fence with barbed  
3 wire over it. So that's what I would like to happen and  
4 thank you very much.

5 MR. GUZIK: Hello. My name is Mark Guzik. I'm  
6 here to -- I'm here because somebody made a call for more  
7 people to make positive statements about the bridge.  
8 I've had my Anchorage map in my truck for a long time.  
9 It never changes. We have no new roads. I've been  
10 building roads for over nine years. We rebuild the same  
11 roads. We finish roads that weren't complete and make  
12 them wider. This is a bridge. This is a bridge that's  
13 going to expand Alaska. It will help us Alaskans to get  
14 to places we haven't been able to get before, easier,  
15 faster and better -- progress. I'm for the bridge.

16 MR. MALTER: I'm Chris Malter. And I know  
17 there's a lot of people from Government Hill here and I  
18 would like to say hi. I'm your new neighbor. I just  
19 bought a house up in Government Hill. And some of these  
20 proposed designs go through my house -- my new house or  
21 under my new house. So I'm certainly opposed to those.  
22 One of the reasons I decided to buy a house in Government  
23 Hill is because I like the community. It's a really cute  
24 place. It's very community oriented.

25 And I think that building access roads through

1 Government Hill is a really bad idea. It's going to  
2 increase traffic. There's going to be safety concerns.  
3 You may need to knock my house down, which I certainly  
4 don't like. And so I think it would be -- you know, I'm  
5 not pro bridge or against the bridge. I'm just concerned  
6 it's going through Government Hill for those reasons.

7 And I would like to see some other concepts go  
8 through other parts of town. I'm not 100 percent sure  
9 why all three go through the Government Hill area.

10 MS. STONE: So we're just about done. We're  
11 going to go to you. Did you want to speak again? Okay.  
12 Okay. We're going to wrap this up really soon. So  
13 everybody forget about speaking except those I've  
14 acknowledged because we're going to have a chance to go  
15 tell people with clipboards or come talk with Rosie here  
16 and record your comments.

17 So we will go ahead with you. I acknowledged  
18 you.

19 MR. BUTLER: Hi, I'm Mark Butler. People in  
20 the old days in Alaska used to talk about -- start a  
21 conversation saying, "Well, I've been here so many  
22 years." So I wanted to be one of those people.  
23 Certainly, I'm not one of those people here that have had  
24 the longest period like Darryl, of course. So I've been  
25 here 30 years, so I guess I qualify as an old time

1 pioneer. Now that's official.

2           Walt Parker, a famous Alaskan friend of a lot  
3 of Alaskans said, "A good community is simply a  
4 collection of good neighborhoods." So the key here on  
5 Government Hill is if you want to go through there -- and  
6 my girlfriend has been a teacher there for many, many  
7 years -- is making sure you keep that community whole.  
8 Because as soon as you start slicing and dicing Anchorage  
9 into little pieces it fails to work as a total city. So  
10 I think that's really important if it does go that way.

11           The bigger picture, certainly it's a nice idea.  
12 I have been generally in favor of this project. And I  
13 have some land up in the mountains in Talkeetna. We'd  
14 love to get up there more quickly.

15           I think from a state-wide perspective -- and  
16 the 4 to 600 million dollar project is a state-wide  
17 project. The Susitna dam project that -- you know, Delta  
18 Barley project. It's one of these kind of big, huge  
19 projects that you're asking Alaskans to invest their  
20 money in. It has to be beneficial for more than just a  
21 few people. And that's the key. That's where we have to  
22 judge it by. Spending 4 to 600 million dollars, plus  
23 whatever else is unstated here that would be the cost of  
24 connecting it, both sides and so forth.

25           So it is a state-wide project. In my mind it's

1 only a state-wide project if it connects regions together  
2 more efficiently.

3 We just spent 150, \$200 million during the  
4 Knowles administration, not in Anchorage, but connecting,  
5 Mat Valley that way. So there's been a big investment  
6 there. So the question is: Is it worth 4 or 600 million  
7 plus more just to connect to the backside of Wasilla?

8 Those that have property there, are generally  
9 in favor of their own community, say sure. It's worth  
10 it. But we don't have much money for development. And I  
11 think a wonderful project that does matter is, we just  
12 talked about the big ditch through Fairview and so forth,  
13 connecting Anchorage together, you know, and so forth,  
14 \$575 million.

15 So in my mind, between those two projects, the  
16 Anchorage project would win hands down. But this is the  
17 task to be seen as a regional state-wide project. So  
18 does it connect the interior and Anchorage more  
19 efficiently? It would only do that if two things  
20 happened in my mind. Having driven to Talkeetna 20 times  
21 a year for the last five years or so -- I got my little  
22 cabin done finally -- that would mean there would have to  
23 be a connection from the north end of the bridge up to  
24 somewhere, generally north, not east towards -- northeast  
25 towards Wasilla, but generally north on a corridor of

1 land up through the Houston area, somewhere around there.  
2 That would take -- it would have to have a railroad  
3 connection.

4 Without those two things this project is not a  
5 state-wide project and benefits just a small group of  
6 people. So it has to have those two. So let's build it  
7 now and then later let's add the railroad -- let's later  
8 add the road up there, doesn't make any sense because  
9 it's got to knock hours off from the tourism industry,  
10 the heavy cargo industry, to people taking stuff to  
11 Fairbanks. Future pipelines, gas lines, would benefit  
12 from this growth straight north. If it doesn't, it fails  
13 the criteria.

14 And over time all of us who have lived here,  
15 like me 30 years, and others -- there are many others who  
16 have many more years than that, they have to pass this  
17 criteria or we all read about them later in history  
18 class -- Alaska's history class as failed projects.

19 MR. SHAFTEL: My name is Dave Shaftel. I'm a  
20 Government Hill resident. I'd just like to follow up.  
21 As you've heard, the Government Hill residents are very  
22 concerned about the three routes that the team has  
23 selected so far that go either through or very close to  
24 the residential area of Government Hill.

25 We've also been concerned and we have raised

1 before the question about why this northern route wasn't  
2 studied. And we raised that question in some of your  
3 preliminary notes about a year ago. And we were told it  
4 was just foreclosed for security reasons.

5 We have the Colonel here tonight, and I was  
6 very pleased to hear his statement that they are very  
7 open to really anything. They're open to consider any  
8 possibilities in terms of this project. And while we  
9 have him here I wonder if we could ask him, as well as  
10 the team here, if they're open, if the team is open, and  
11 if the Colonel and Elmendorf and Fort Richardson are open  
12 to considering a route, let's say a fourth route that  
13 would either skirt the bases or go through the bases in  
14 some fashion, that would be much more direct in terms of  
15 access to the ultimate bridge, and also would not disrupt  
16 either the port -- you've heard very serious concerns  
17 from people in the port about how this would disrupt  
18 their variable transportation down there. It would avoid  
19 the problems that Government Hill would have and would  
20 solve hopefully a -- make a much more efficient, direct  
21 route to the bridge itself.

22 MS. STONE: Your three minutes are up.

23 MR. SHAFTEL: Is it possible to respond to  
24 that?

25 COLONEL TORRES: What I'd like to do -- again,

1 Colonel Torres, Chief of Staff for Alaska Command.

2 Any alternative that is presented to us will be  
3 fully analyzed and when we analyze that, we need to  
4 ensure that the critical mission requirements, the  
5 operational requirements, and our security requirements  
6 are maintained. And those are the three foundations that  
7 we must, we must ensure, because we have -- we're  
8 chartered to do certain things for the Department of  
9 Defense.

10 So as we do our analysis on any alternative  
11 that is presented to us, that's the foundation. And, of  
12 course, there's a multitude of other things. But we must  
13 be able to conduct our mission and our operational  
14 requirements that are dictated by the Department of  
15 Defense.

16 So as they're given to us, we'll provide our  
17 feedback and then, through that course, as I understand,  
18 the EIS process will take the pros and cons from  
19 everybody and then rack and stack them, and then I guess  
20 there's a preferred alternative that comes out, and then  
21 it goes out for public reviews.

22 SPEAKER: Does that mean that it could go  
23 through base conceivably as long as it meets those  
24 requirements?

25 COLONEL TORRES: As we do that -- I'm not the

1        decision maker. But I'm saying again, we would do our  
2        analysis. And based on all of the considerations, we  
3        would propose that. I don't know -- nothing has been  
4        presented where it would enter, the route where it would  
5        go through and all that. So we would have to see that.  
6        We have not seen anything. We are bridge neutral. We  
7        need to ensure everybody understands, we must be able to  
8        do our operational and our mission requirements.

9                    If we can do that and maintain everything, I  
10        would assume we would provide that information and that  
11        analysis would be conducted, or that decision would be  
12        determined at a higher level.

13                   MS. STONE: You have about 30 seconds.

14                   MR. RING: That's all I'm worth. I might save  
15        you 15 seconds.

16                   First of all, I want to thank you very much and  
17        the people with you that have organized this meeting.

18                   Secondly. I would like to ask that you  
19        announce soon on another meeting. And I would like to  
20        see them about once a month. You know, if we can talk  
21        this bridge into existence I want to start talking.

22                   MS. STONE: So at this point I want to thank  
23        all of you that --

24                   SPEAKER: I just wanted to let everybody know I  
25        really appreciate all the support that I've heard here

1       tonight.

2                   MS. STONE: Thank you-all for coming and for  
3 being respectful of each other and making sure there was  
4 time for others to speak and giving us lots of ideas,  
5 needs and concerns, and issues to be addressed in this  
6 study. It's been very helpful.

7                   We invite you to fill out comment cards, to  
8 talk with the project team members in the display area,  
9 and to help finish up the goodies.

10                   (Public meeting concluded at 8:10 p.m.)

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, ROSIE S. SCOTT, CSR, hereby certify:

That I am a Certified Shorthand Reporter for Alaska Stenotype Reporters and Notary Public for the State of Alaska; that the foregoing proceedings were taken by me in computerized machine shorthand and thereafter transcribed by me; that the transcript constitutes a full, true and correct record of said meeting taken on the date and time indicated therein.

Further, that I am a disinterested person to said action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed my hand and affixed my official seal this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2005.

\_\_\_\_\_  
ROSIE S. SCOTT  
Certified Shorthand Reporter  
My Commission Expires  
8/16/08