

**From:** [mail=eklutnahydro.com@wpdatacenter.com](mailto:mail=eklutnahydro.com@wpdatacenter.com) on behalf of [dennis hansen](#)  
**To:** [Sam Owen](#)  
**Subject:** New Message From Eklutna Hydro - CONTACT US  
**Date:** Sunday, February 18, 2024 3:18:07 PM

---

Hello,

As a MULTI-GENERATION and lifelong Alaskan, thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the Eklutna Hydroelectric 1991 Fish & Wildlife Agreement study results and proposed project. I fully agree as stewards of the natural resources in this great land we need to wisely manage and use the resources provided to us. Reviewing the proposed alternatives and cost benefit analysis I do not see an alternative which provides benefits that justify the cost or scope proposed. The owner's alternative (as well as the others) does provide for year round flow in the Eklutna River for the spawning and rearing of Coho, Chinook, and Sockeye salmon. However, the alternative's analysis only provides information on the habitat gain's provided by the proposed project, not the anticipated size of the salmon run. The size of the run is an important metric as it will help decision makers and the public better determine the cost and benefit of the proposed alternative. Per study personnel the estimated salmon run achieved by these proposed alternatives is between 200 and 1,000 salmon per year. With a projected annual cost of \$2.8 Million this means the cost per salmon will range from \$14,000 to \$2,800 per salmon. In addition the small run will not be able to provide a sustainable food source. To ensure longevity of the run most salmon must be allowed to spawn and bag limits on the Eklutna river will be very small.

The final cost which does not have an offsetting benefit, is the reduced power production of the Eklutna hydroelectric plant. The Eklutna hydroelectric plant provides clean, reliable, low cost electricity to all railbelt customers. No major maintenance or end of life issues are present at the plant which would limit or reduce its capacity and longevity to provide clean, efficient power. As such, intentionally limiting the operation and reducing capacity of the Eklutna hydroelectric plant only results in inefficiency and reduced performance of the railbelt electrical generation system. This change impacts all railbelt customers and requires increased electrical generation using less efficient and clean power sources.

For the reasons listed above I request that the recommended solution of the 1991 Fish & Wildlife Agreement study to the Governor of Alaska be that the study finds the impacts of the Eklutna Hydroelectric plant have already been realized since construction in 1955 and no further impacts to the environment are imposed. Mitigations and enhancements are found to have an unfavorable cost to benefit ratio. Continued operation of the Eklutna hydroelectric plant, Eklutna dam, and AWWU water source is recommended to continue as is.

Respectfully,  
Dennis H.