


ALASKA LEGISLATURE SPECIAL COMMITTEE / SUBJECT FILES 86/2

1005 SCOM44: HOUSE POWER ALTERNATIVES STUDY COMM. 1979-8005



AuF&G Fisheries Divisions
Regional Offices

Aquatic Studies Leader
FB IV

Clerical and
Administrative
Support

1 Admin. Asst. I
1 CT III
1 Pub. Spec. II
3 CT II

Technical
Support

1 Biometrician III
2 Biometrician II
1 Maintenance Mech. II
1 Cartographer II

Resident and Juvenile
Anadromous Project Leader
FB III

--- FT III

Spatial and Seasonal
Habitat Project Leader
FB III

--- Hydrologist III

2 FB I/II
3 FB I

Anadromous Adult
Project Leader - FB III

Cook Inlet to Talkeetna
6 FB I (1980)
7 FB I (1981)

Talkeetna to Devils Canyon
3 FB I

Devils Canyon to Tyone River
3 FB I

Cook Inlet
Scale Collection
FB I

6 FT I

Scale Analysis
FB I

5 FT III

Electrophoresis
Graduate Student

6 FT II

Stock Assessment


Radiotelemetry
FB II

2 FB I
1 FT II

Sonar - Tagging
Creel Census
FB II

Cook Inlet to Yentna
4 FB I
2 FT II

Yentna to Talkeetna
4 FB I
12 FT II



STATE OF ALASKA

Attachment I

JAY S. HAMMOND, GOVERNOR

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

LAND AND WATER MANAGEMENT

323 E. 4TH AVENUE - ANCHORAGE 99501

October 26, 1979

Mr. Eric Yould
Executive Director
Alaska Power Authority
333 W. Fourth Avenue
Anchorage, Alaska 99501

Dear Mr. Yould:

Enclosed is a proposal for evaluation of stream flow manipulation effects downstream of the Devil's Canyon dam site as part of the Susitna Dam feasibility studies. During preparation of this proposal our staff coordinated closely with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game so that this proposal and their proposal for spatial and seasonal habitat studies would maximize joint use of field personnel, equipment, and transportation to eliminate any duplication and redundancy.

The Alaska Department of Natural Resources has major management and regulatory responsibilities under AS 46.15 (the Alaska Water Use Act) and AS 38.05 (Alaska Land Use Act). The Department will have to process applications for water rights and construction permits prior to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission licensing process. In the process of acting upon such applications the Department is directed by AS 46.15.080, to consider the following relevant items:

1. the benefit to the applicant resulting from the proposed appropriation
 2. the effect of economic activity resulting from the proposed appropriation
 3. the effect on fish and game resources and public recreational opportunities
 4. the effect of loss of alternate uses of water that might be made within a reasonable time if not precluded or hindered by the proposed appropriation
 5. the effect upon access to navigable or public waters
- The commissioner is authorized by AS 46.15.100 to issue a permit subject to terms, conditions, restrictions or limitations necessary to protect the rights of others and the public interest.

In addition to the statutory directives listed above, my division is charged with conducting the state land disposal program. We presently have 117,399 acres of land west of the Susitna River and south of

Trapper's Creek classified for disposal. During this fiscal year alone we will be selling 31,375 net acres. With the price of gold rising, we also expect additional activity in the area, particularly in the Kahiltna drainage. The only means of access is by aircraft, snowmachine, or riverboat via the lower Susitna River with major access points from Talkeetna and from Willow via the Little Susitna River.

We understand that the preliminary plan of study submitted by Acres American suggests terminating the downstream study boundary at Talkeetna. Examination of existing hydrological records and project show that approximately 43% of the average flow in the Susitna main stem near Talkeetna will be subject to manipulation by the power project. Given this situation we can not adequately address concerns that will arise over navigation and fisheries downstream from Talkeetna to salt water without studies being conducted on this reach of the river. By including these essential issues in the scope of APA funded investigations, management agencies and the public will have the necessary information to objectively consider tradeoffs between downstream resource uses and optimum operation of the dam and reservoir for power generation.


We would prefer the opportunity to review Acres revised plan of study in comparison to the Corps of Engineers year old plan of study prior to APA's final selection decision. Given the timeframe for APA's decision process it appears this will not be possible. Therefore by copy of this letter I am forwarding the attached proposal to Acres for their consideration for inclusion into their POS.

Should Acres and APA desire to use the Department of Natural Resources or Fish and Game as a subcontractor in this effort I suggest that any authorization of funds to DNR be executed by a Reimbursable Service Agreement (RSA) with payments subject to approval by Acres as the study manager. The reason for this is to avoid delays in accepting and receiving authorization to expend funds from non-state sources which requires conduct of the Revised Program (RP) process. Work under an RSA between state agencies could commence within a month whereas the RP process could take up to three months.

While we feel that state agencies could adequately conduct elements of the feasibility study in a compatible time frame for FERC licensing submission, the basic concern is that work be done which enables appropriate management agencies to execute their responsibilities in a timely manner for all concerned. Should a private subcontractor be selected for all elements of the study, I suggest that APA consider retention of certain scientific and durable equipment (flow recorders, meters, boats, etc.) that may be purchased for the project. Your agency will undoubtedly be conducting such studies across the state for a number of years, whereas outside contractors may or may not be working in the state in future years. Such an arrangement could reduce outlays for future studies by providing a pool of certain necessary equipment instate.

I hope this information is helpful. Please do not hesitate to contact me or my staff if you have any questions. We look forward to continued involvement in this project.

Sincerely,



Theodore G. Smith, Director
Division of Forest, Land and Water Management

cc: John Lawrence, Acres American
Jeff Haynes, Deputy Commissioner, DNR Tom Trent, ADF&G
Charles Behlke, Chairman, Alaska Power Authority
Brent Petrie, WMS
Bill Long, DGGS

TASK: Assessment of Instream Flow Requirements for the Susitna River.
(In cooperation with ADF&G Spatial and Seasonal Habitat Studies)

BACKGROUND:

Increased water demands and significant changes in flow regimes sometimes result in conflicts over water use. A major concern of many resource agencies is the conflict between out-of-stream uses of water or flow regime changes and the needs of fish and wildlife, navigation, recreation and other instream flow uses. DNR, in conjunction with ADF&G, USFWS, USGS, ADEC, ADOTPF, and the U.S. Water Resources Council, is presently pursuing an instream flow program for the State of Alaska. The program is patterned after the procedures developed by the Cooperative Instream Flow Service Group, Department of the Interior, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, located at Fort Collins, Colorado.

Work has initially begun during this past summer by ADF&G, DNR, and other interested agencies to obtain field data from Willow and Deception Creeks in the Susitna Basin and analysis of this data is currently underway. Additional funding for ADF&G and DNR to pursue the Willow and Deception Creeks study has recently been authorized by the U.S. Water Resources Council. Data produced as a result of this federal grant will augment the instream flow work performed as part of the Susitna Dam feasibility study.

PARTICIPATION:

This study will be performed in addition to work proposed by ADF&G, but will be done in close cooperation and coordination with that agency and other tasks performed by consultants as part of the overall Susitna Dam feasibility study. If the ADF&G instream flow study as part of their Spatial and Seasonal Habitat Studies is not funded, DNR will need to increase this budget in the amount that ADF&G was not budgeted, in order to perform the necessary work. It is anticipated that other agencies such as USFWS and USGS will participate in these instream flow studies, particularly the USFWS during data processing and analysis.

TASK OBJECTIVES:

This study will extend the field methods in use in the Willow and Deception Creek basins to serve as a tool to assess the effects of different flow regimes on aquatic and riparian habitat in the Susitna River. The study will provide data to the Alaska Power Authority (APA) on which decisions may be made regarding dam location, design, and operation through the following objectives.

- A. The study will provide data to allow the APA to make decisions regarding the magnitude and timing of flow releases from the proposed dams.
- B. The study will allow the APA to evaluate the effects of altered flow regimes on fisheries in the Susitna River along with other instream uses of the Susitna River such as boating and navigation.

- C. Data generated from this study will aid the APA in evaluating dam design and operation to optimize power production.
- D. Data generated from this study can be utilized by the APA for planning and evaluating necessary mitigation measures for downstream resources.
- E. Results of this study will provide necessary data to regulatory and management agencies, such as DNR, ADF&G, DEC, USFWS, NMFS and FERC, such that these agencies can adequately perform their permitting and management responsibilities.

LIST OF SUBTASKS:

The above stated objectives will be accomplished through the following subtasks. Cooperating agencies and/or firms are also indicated.

- A) Consultation with state and federal agencies and consulting firms to coordinate the plan of study (DNR, APA, Acres, R&M, TES, ADF&G, USGS, USFWS).
- B) Order equipment and arrange logistical support (DNR, ADF&G, USGS, CIRI/H&N).
- C) Training in field techniques and data interpretation for project personnel (DNR, ADF&G, USFWS, USGS).
- D) Conversion of software to an accessible computer and training of computer personnel (ADF&G, USFWS, ACRES, DNR).
- E) Development and refining of preliminary probability of use curves (ADF&G, DNR, USFWS, USGS).
- F) Collection of data to refine and validate probability of use curves (ADF&G, DNR, USFWS, USGS).
- G) Collection of hydrological (stream flow) data (DNR, ADF&G, USGS, USFWS).
- H) Data processing and analysis (ADF&G, USFWS, USGS, and DNR).
- I) Utilizing this data and analysis, provide information to licensing and management agencies (APA, FERC, DNR, ADF&G, DEC).

STUDY LOCATION:

Selection of study reaches in the Susitna River System will be required to provide the necessary flow information for this study. Sites will be required on the main stem of the Susitna River downstream from the proposed dam sites to salt water with additional sites located on major tributaries in the proposed study area. A wide variety of representative selections will be required to delineate the probability of use curves for the aquatic environment. Location of the transects will require close coordination with state and federal wildlife agencies,

the USGS and involved consultants to satisfy hydrologic and hydraulic considerations for determining channel morphology and aquatic habitat parameters for defining preferred habitat in these areas.

SCHEDULE:

This study will require three years of data collection and analysis as outlined below.

A. First Year:

1. Coordination of plan of study, personnel, equipment, and site selection of transects.
2. Order equipment and arrange logistical support.
3. Project staffing.
4. Conversion of software to an accessible computer in Alaska.
5. Development and refinement of preliminary probability of use curves.
6. Initial collection of stream flow data.
7. Initial data processing and analysis.

B. Second Year:

1. Continue data collection.
2. Continue data processing and analysis.
3. Refine and validate probability of use curves.

C. Third Year:

1. Complete data collection.
2. Complete data processing and analysis.
3. Complete probability of use curves.
4. Report writing and submission of data to APA for utilization in FERC licensing and permitting processes.

BUDGET:

The total budget for DNR involvement in this study will be \$407,861.00 over the three year duration of the study. This is broken out per year below, with a detailed budget for the first year attached.

4

A. First Year:

Personal Services	\$ 92,706.00
Travel	14,400.00
Commodities	2,100.00
Contractual	21,000.00
Equipment	57,655.00

Total First Year Budget	\$187,861.00
-------------------------	--------------

B. Second Year:

Little extra equipment will be needed. This year's budget will be comprised primarily of Personal Services, Travel and Commodities as shown above totaling approximately \$110,000.00.

C. Third Year:

This year's budget will approximate the second year, totaling \$110,000.00.

**PROPOSED BUDGET SUSITNA
INSTREAM FLOW PROJECT**

Personal Services

- (1) Hydrologist III 18A 12 months = 34,178.64
- (1) Ecologist I 16A 12 months = 29,750.76
- (2) Temp. Land Management Tech II 14A 6 months = 21,563.40
- Overtime for LMT II = \$7214.00

Total \$92,706.00

Travel

- 2 positions 800.00 per month x 8 months = 6,400
- 2 positions 800.00 per month x 6 months = 4,800

(Training) 2 positions (out-of-state) 800.00
each = 1,600 x 2 trips = \$3,200.00

Total \$14,400.00

Commodities

\$250/year x 2.5 positions = \$625.00
Gas, oil, motor \$1,500.00

(2 ea.) Hard hats, hip boots and chest waders = \$475.00

Total \$2,100.00

Contractual

- A. Consult instream flow group. 3 of them will fly to Alaska from Ft. Collins, Colorado and return. 1 person from Alaska to fly to Ft. Collins and return. \$3200.00.
- B. Repairs of boat, motor and other equipment \$1000.00.
- C. Phone 200.00 per month per phone x 2 x 12 mo. = \$4,800.00. This includes long distance calls.
- D. Plane charter to fly over sites \$2,000.00.
- E. Computer analysis of field data \$10,000.00.

Totals \$21,000.00

Equipment

Office equipment

- 1. 2 desks, 2 chairs, 1 bookcase, 1 file cabinet = \$1,300.00
- 2. 1 calculator 300.00
- 3. (Special) paper, rite in rain, forms, and printing = \$700.00

Field equipment

1. Level, Lietz B-2 (32x)	\$1,600.00
2. Tripod (dome)	250.00
3. Survey stakes	150.00
4. Measuring tape & holder (300 ft.)	150.00
5. 35 mm camera and lens, film and development	900.00
6. Electronic surveying equipment, angle measurements, range measurements, field computer	20,500.00
7. Current meters, pygmy and AA meter	500.00
8. Marsh-McBirny flow meter, digital readout	1,600.00
9. (2) topsetting wading rods	400.00
10. Suspended system (flow metering system)	400.00
11. Boat mounted (flow metering system)	1,600.00
12. Sonar - narrow beam	3,000.00
13. Headset and battery	50.00
14. 2 way radio, walkie talkie (2 sets)	2,000.00
15. Compass	100.00
16. (2) portable ultrasonic level and flow recorder	6,800.00
17. (2 ea.) First Aid Kit	200.00
18. Bank anchors $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 48" rebar	20.00
19. (2) leveling rod (Philadelphia)	300.00
20. (1) Cable tagline 300+feet	150.00
21. Tools for repairs	175.00

Boat equipment

20 foot riverboat	\$4,000.00
13 foot Avon riverboat	1,800.00
85 hp (jet boat)	3,000.00
25 hp (Kicker) jet foot	1,200.00
10 hp for Avon (jet foot)	700.00
25 gallon gas tank	350.00
(2) 10 gallon gas tanks	60.00
(4) life vests	150.00
Boat trailer (service contract)	2,000.00
Oars (2 sets)	150.00
(2) Anchor, anchor rope	100.00

Camping equipment

Tents, stoves, lanterns, personal sleeping bags, cooking equipment	1,000.00
--	----------

Total all equipment:	\$ 57,655.00
Total Personal, travel, contractual, commodities:	\$130,206.00
Total budget:	\$187,861.00

Budget for additional years would be less because little extra equipment would be needed. Estimated cost for additional years \$110,000.00 per year.

PLEASE NOTE: THE PRECEDING PAGES WERE TREATED
AS A UNIT IN THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENT.

STATE OF ALASKA

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

LAND AND WATER MANAGEMENT

323 E. 4TH AVENUE - ANCHORAGE 99501

B. Rogers
JAY S. HAMMOND, GOVERNOR

October 26, 1979

Mr. Eric Yould
Executive Director
Alaska Power Authority
333 W. Fourth Avenue
Anchorage, Alaska 99501

Dear Mr. Yould:

Enclosed is a proposal for evaluation of stream flow manipulation effects downstream of the Devil's Canyon dam site as part of the Susitna Dam feasibility studies. During preparation of this proposal our staff coordinated closely with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game so that this proposal and their proposal for spatial and seasonal habitat studies would maximize joint use of field personnel, equipment, and transportation to eliminate any duplication and redundancy.

The Alaska Department of Natural Resources has major management and regulatory responsibilities under AS 46.15 (the Alaska Water Use Act) and AS 38.05 (Alaska Land Use Act). The Department will have to process applications for water rights and construction permits prior to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission licensing process. In the process of acting upon such applications the Department is directed by AS 46.15.080, to consider the following relevant items:

1. the benefit to the applicant resulting from the proposed appropriation
 2. the effect of economic activity resulting from the proposed appropriation
 3. the effect on fish and game resources and public recreational opportunities
 4. the effect of loss of alternate uses of water that might be made within a reasonable time if not precluded or hindered by the proposed appropriation
 5. the effect upon access to navigable or public waters
- The commissioner is authorized by AS 46.15.100 to issue a permit subject to terms, conditions, restrictions or limitations necessary to protect the rights of others and the public interest.

In addition to the statutory directives listed above, my division is charged with conducting the state land disposal program. We presently have 117,399 acres of land west of the Susitna River and south of

Trapper's Creek classified for disposal. During this fiscal year alone we will be selling 31,375 net acres. With the price of gold rising, we also expect additional activity in the area, particularly in the Kahiltna drainage. The only means of access is by aircraft, snowmachine, or riverboat via the lower Susitna River with major access points from Talkeetna and from Willow via the Little Susitna River.

We understand that the preliminary plan of study submitted by Acres American suggests terminating the downstream study boundary at Talkeetna. Examination of existing hydrological records and project show that approximately 43% of the average flow in the Susitna main stem near Talkeetna will be subject to manipulation by the power project. Given this situation we can not adequately address concerns that will arise over navigation and fisheries downstream from Talkeetna to salt water without studies being conducted on this reach of the river. By including these essential issues in the scope of APA funded investigations, management agencies and the public will have the necessary information to objectively consider tradeoffs between downstream resource uses and optimum operation of the dam and reservoir for power generation.


We would prefer the opportunity to review Acres revised plan of study in comparison to the Corps of Engineers year old plan of study prior to APA's final selection decision. Given the timeframe for APA's decision process it appears this will not be possible. Therefore by copy of this letter I am forwarding the attached proposal to Acres for their consideration for inclusion into their POS.

Should Acres and APA desire to use the Department of Natural Resources or Fish and Game as a subcontractor in this effort I suggest that any authorization of funds to DNR be executed by a Reimbursable Service Agreement (RSA) with payments subject to approval by Acres as the study manager. The reason for this is to avoid delays in accepting and receiving authorization to expend funds from non-state sources which requires conduct of the Revised Program (RP) process. Work under an RSA between state agencies could commence within a month whereas the RP process could take up to three months.

While we feel that state agencies could adequately conduct elements of the feasibility study in a compatible time frame for FERC licensing submission, the basic concern is that work be done which enables appropriate management agencies to execute their responsibilities in a timely manner for all concerned. Should a private subcontractor be selected for all elements of the study, I suggest that APA consider retention of certain scientific and durable equipment (flow recorders, meters, boats, etc.) that may be purchased for the project. Your agency will undoubtedly be conducting such studies across the state for a number of years, whereas outside contractors may or may not be working in the state in future years. Such an arrangement could reduce outlays for future studies by providing a pool of certain necessary equipment instate.

I hope this information is helpful. Please do not hesitate to contact me or my staff if you have any questions. We look forward to continued involvement in this project.

Sincerely,



Theodore G. Smith, Director
Division of Forest, Land and Water Management

cc: John Lawrence, Acres American
Jeff Haynes, Deputy Commissioner, DNR Tom Trent, ADF&G
Charles Behlke, Chairman, Alaska Power Authority
Brent Petrie, WMS
Bill Long, DGGs

TASK: Assessment of Instream Flow Requirements for the Susitna River.
(In cooperation with ADF&G Spatial and Seasonal Habitat Studies)

BACKGROUND:

Increased water demands and significant changes in flow regimes sometimes result in conflicts over water use. A major concern of many resource agencies is the conflict between out-of-stream uses of water or flow regime changes and the needs of fish and wildlife, navigation, recreation and other instream flow uses. DNR, in conjunction with ADF&G, USFWS, USGS, ADEC, ADOTPF, and the U.S. Water Resources Council, is presently pursuing an instream flow program for the State of Alaska. The program is patterned after the procedures developed by the Cooperative Instream Flow Service Group, Department of the Interior, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, located at Fort Collins, Colorado.

Work has initially begun during this past summer by ADF&G, DNR, and other interested agencies to obtain field data from Willow and Deception Creeks in the Susitna Basin and analysis of this data is currently underway. Additional funding for ADF&G and DNR to pursue the Willow and Deception Creeks study has recently been authorized by the U.S. Water Resources Council. Data produced as a result of this federal grant will augment the instream flow work performed as part of the Susitna Dam feasibility study.

PARTICIPATION:

This study will be performed in addition to work proposed by ADF&G, but will be done in close cooperation and coordination with that agency and other tasks performed by consultants as part of the overall Susitna Dam feasibility study. If the ADF&G instream flow study as part of their Spatial and Seasonal Habitat Studies is not funded, DNR will need to increase this budget in the amount that ADF&G was not budgeted, in order to perform the necessary work. It is anticipated that other agencies such as USFWS and USGS will participate in these instream flow studies, particularly the USFWS during data processing and analysis.

TASK OBJECTIVES:

This study will extend the field methods in use in the Willow and Deception Creek basins to serve as a tool to assess the effects of different flow regimes on aquatic and riparian habitat in the Susitna River. The study will provide data to the Alaska Power Authority (APA) on which decisions may be made regarding dam location, design, and operation through the following objectives.

- A. The study will provide data to allow the APA to make decisions regarding the magnitude and timing of flow releases from the proposed dams.
- B. The study will allow the APA to evaluate the effects of altered flow regimes on fisheries in the Susitna River along with other instream uses of the Susitna River such as boating and navigation.

- C. Data generated from this study will aid the APA in evaluating dam design and operation to optimize power production.
- D. Data generated from this study can be utilized by the APA for planning and evaluating necessary mitigation measures for downstream resources.
- E. Results of this study will provide necessary data to regulatory and management agencies, such as DNR, ADF&G, DEC, USFWS, NMFS and FERC, such that these agencies can adequately perform their permitting and management responsibilities.

LIST OF SUBTASKS:

The above stated objectives will be accomplished through the following subtasks. Cooperating agencies and/or firms are also indicated.

- A) Consultation with state and federal agencies and consulting firms to coordinate the plan of study (DNR, APA, Acres, R&M, TES, ADF&G, USGS, USFWS).
- B) Order equipment and arrange logistical support (DNR, ADF&G, USGS, CIRI/H&N).
- C) Training in field techniques and data interpretation for project personnel (DNR, ADF&G, USFWS, USGS).
- D) Conversion of software to an accessible computer and training of computer personnel (ADF&G, USFWS, ACRES, DNR).
- E) Development and refining of preliminary probability of use curves (ADF&G, DNR, USFWS, USGS).
- F) Collection of data to refine and validate probability of use curves (ADF&G, DNR, USFWS, USGS).
- G) Collection of hydrological (stream flow) data (DNR, ADF&G, USGS, USFWS).
- H) Data processing and analysis (ADF&G, USFWS, USGS, and DNR).
- I) Utilizing this data and analysis, provide information to licensing and management agencies (APA, FERC, DNR, ADF&G, DEC).

STUDY LOCATION:

Selection of study reaches in the Susitna River System will be required to provide the necessary flow information for this study. Sites will be required on the main stem of the Susitna River downstream from the proposed dam sites to salt water with additional sites located on major tributaries in the proposed study area. A wide variety of representative selections will be required to delineate the probability of use curves for the aquatic environment. Location of the transects will require close coordination with state and federal wildlife agencies,

the USGS and involved consultants to satisfy hydrologic and hydraulic considerations for determining channel morphology and aquatic habitat parameters for defining preferred habitat in these areas.

SCHEDULE:

This study will require three years of data collection and analysis as outlined below.

A. First Year:

1. Coordination of plan of study, personnel, equipment, and site selection of transects.
2. Order equipment and arrange logistical support.
3. Project staffing.
4. Conversion of software to an accessible computer in Alaska.
5. Development and refinement of preliminary probability of use curves.
6. Initial collection of stream flow data.
7. Initial data processing and analysis.

B. Second Year:

1. Continue data collection.
2. Continue data processing and analysis.
3. Refine and validate probability of use curves.

C. Third Year:

1. Complete data collection.
2. Complete data processing and analysis.
3. Complete probability of use curves.
4. Report writing and submission of data to APA for utilization in FERC licensing and permitting processes.

BUDGET:

The total budget for DNR involvement in this study will be \$407,861.00 over the three year duration of the study. This is broken out per year below, with a detailed budget for the first year attached.

A. First Year:

Personal Services	\$ 92,706.00
Travel	14,400.00
Commodities	2,100.00
Contractual	21,000.00
Equipment	57,655.00
 Total First Year Budget	 \$187,861.00

B. Second Year:

Little extra equipment will be needed. This year's budget will be comprised primarily of Personal Services, Travel and Commodities as shown above totaling approximately \$110,000.00.

C. Third Year:

This year's budget will approximate the second year, totaling \$110,000.00.

PROPOSED BUDGET SUSITNA
INSTREAM FLOW PROJECT

Personal Services

- (1) Hydrologist III 18A 12 months = 34,178.64
- (1) Ecologist I 16A 12 months = 29,750.76
- (2) Temp. Land Management Tech II 14A 6 months = 21,563.40
- Overtime for LMT II = \$7214.00

Total \$92,706.00

Travel

- 2 positions 800.00 per month x 8 months = 6,400
- 2 positions 800.00 per month x 6 months = 4,800

(Training) 2 positions (out-of-state) 800.00
each = 1,600 x 2 trips = \$3,200.00

Total \$14,400.00

Commodities

\$250/year x 2.5 positions = \$625.00
Gas, oil, motor \$1,500.00

(2 ea.) Hard hats, hip boots and chest waders = \$475.00

Total \$2,100.00

Contractual

- A. Consult instream flow group. 3 of them will fly to Alaska from Ft. Collins, Colorado and return. 1 person from Alaska to fly to Ft. Collins and return. \$3200.00.
- B. Repairs of boat, motor and other equipment \$1000.00.
- C. Phone 200.00 per month per phone x 2 x 12 mo. = \$4,800.00. This includes long distance calls.
- D. Plane charter to fly over sites \$2,000.00.
- E. Computer analysis of field data \$10,000.00.

Totals \$21,000.00

Equipment

Office equipment

- 1. 2 desks, 2 chairs, 1 bookcase, 1 file cabinet = \$1,300.00
- 2. 1 calculator 300.00
- 3. (Special) paper, rite in rain, forms, and printing = \$700.00

Field equipment

1. Level, Lietz B-2 (32x)	\$1,600.00
2. Tripod (dome)	250.00
3. Survey stakes	150.00
4. Measuring tape & holder (300 ft.)	150.00
5. 35 mm camera and lens, film and development	900.00
6. Electronic surveying equipment, angle measurements, range measurements, field computer	20,500.00
7. Current meters, pygmy and AA meter	500.00
8. Marsh-McBirny flow meter, digital readout	1,600.00
9. (2) topsetting wading rods	400.00
10. Suspended system (flow metering system)	400.00
11. Boat mounted (flow metering system)	1,600.00
12. Sonar - narrow beam	3,000.00
13. Headset and battery	50.00
14. 2 way radio, walkie talkie (2 sets)	2,000.00
15. Compass	100.00
16. (2) portable ultrasonic level and flow recorder	6,800.00
17. (2 ea.) First Aid Kit	200.00
18. Bank anchors $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 48" rebar	20.00
19. (2) leveling rod (Philadelphia)	300.00
20. (1) Cable tagline 300+feet	150.00
21. Tools for repairs	175.00

Boat equipment

20 foot riverboat	\$4,000.00
13 foot Avon riverboat	1,800.00
85 hp (jet boat)	3,000.00
25 hp (Kicker) jet foot	1,200.00
10 hp for Avon (jet foot)	700.00
25 gallon gas tank	350.00
(2) 10 gallon gas tanks	60.00
(4) life vests	150.00
Boat trailer (service contract)	2,000.00
Oars (2 sets)	150.00
(2) Anchor, anchor rope	100.00

Camping equipment

Tents, stoves, lanterns, personal sleeping bags, cooking equipment	1,000.00
--	----------

Total all equipment:	\$ 57,655.00
Total Personal, travel, contractual, commodities:	\$130,206.00
Total budget:	\$187,861.00

Budget for additional years would be less because little extra equipment would be needed. Estimated cost for additional years \$110,000.00 per year.

SCOMM

#44.39

MARK
Looks Good
Dy

Potential Caribou - Ice Problems in the Watana Reservoir,




Figure 1. Susitna hydroelectric site.

INTRODUCTION

Caribou from the Nelchina herd cross the Susitna River biannually in the vicinity of the proposed Susitna Hydroelectric Project. It appears that the Watana Reservoir will be sited near or on three caribou crossing areas. Since past studies¹ of caribou behavior have shown that disturbance of their natural habitat by various construction projects (e.g. roads, pipelines etc.) can disrupt their normal behavior, it is important to try to determine what effect the Susitna Hydroelec-

tric Project will have on the Nelchina caribou herd. The purposes of this article are to show that the Watana Reservoir does have the potential to affect caribou migrations and to raise some questions that should be answered before the nature and extent of the effects that the presence of the reservoir may have on the caribou can be predicted.

The Watana Reservoir on the Susitna River will be 54 miles (90 km) in length with the dam located about 134 miles (216 km) from the mouth of the river (Fig. 1). The reservoir will be contained

Susitna Hydroelectric Project

within a narrow canyon 1/3 to 1 mile (0.5 to 1.6 km) wide for much of its length, except near the tributaries where it will be wider, particularly at Watana Creek and to a lesser extent at Jay and Kosina Creeks and the Oshetna River.² The reservoir level is expected to vary 80 to 125 ft (24.4 to 38.1 m) from October to April of the hydrologic year which corresponds to the period of ice formation and growth in the reservoir. Maximum daily variations should be less than 2 ft (.61 m). Table 1 shows the minimum draw-down schedule for the pool, starting at its maximum level of 2185 ft (666.4 m).

Parts of the Nelchina caribou herd, consisting of 15,000 animals, cross the Susitna River from the north to south in late April and early May to reach their calving grounds. Later in the summer (late July to early September), they re-cross the river going north.³ Although very little work has been done on current migration routes, and these may change periodically or may even be random, it is thought that the Watana Reservoir will affect three general crossing areas at Fog Creek, Jay Creek, and the Oshetna River. Caribou have been observed in these areas at the time of breakup, possibly waiting until the largest ice floes clear from the river before crossing.⁴ It is not known exactly how many caribou cross at these points.

POTENTIAL PROBLEMS AND QUESTIONS

Possibly the most serious problem may be the presence of the reservoir; the caribou may not even attempt to cross. We leave this important problem to



The two caribou photographs in this article are courtesy of Dr. David Klein.

TABLE 1
Maximum Water Level — Minimum Draw-down Schedule

Mid-month	Starting Level	Ending Level	Change
Oct.	2185'	2185'	0
Nov.	2185'	2185'	0
Dec.	2185'	2175'	-10'
Jan.	2175'	2145'	-30'
Feb.	2145'	2130'	-15'
March	2130'	2115'	-15'
April	2115'	2105'	-10'
May	2105'	2125'	+20'
June	2125'	2170'	+45'
July	2170'	2185'	+15'
Aug.	2185'	2185'	0
Sept.	2185'	2185'	0




Figure 2. Eklutna Lake showing ice shelving on a gently sloping shore. (Photograph by C. Stephens.)

students of caribou behavior and proceed to potential problems caused by the physical nature of the reservoir.

Warm water released from the reservoir will prevent a stable ice cover from forming on the river. This open water may extend downstream to Talkeetna or farther, depending on weather conditions, so that the Fog Creek crossing will be open water at all times of the year. This should not create a problem for the caribou since they normally swim the river, unless they somehow depend on the ice cover for crossing at certain times.

Winter draw-down of the reservoir will produce ice-covered shores or so-called ice shelves. These ice shelves are formed when the floating reservoir ice cover be-

comes grounded on the shores as the reservoir level decreases during the winter. An example of ice shelving on a gently sloping shore at Eklutna Lake, near Anchorage, is shown in Figure 2. The grounded ice cover may assume the same shape as the shore or it may fracture, creating deep cracks, or it may even remain suspended in some places. We suggest that an ice-covered shore that is steep, contains cracks, or has the potential for caving under the weight of caribou, may present a serious obstacle to their crossing the reservoir.

The slope of the ice-covered shores in the draw-down zone can be used to give an indication of the location of very steep areas that the caribou may have dif-

ficulty negotiating. We have measured the slope of the north and south shores of the reservoir using a 1:63,360 scale map. The slope was measured between the 2075 ft (632.9 m) contour line and the 2185 ft (666.4 m) contour line which corresponds to the largest draw-down when starting from maximum pool. Figures 3 and 4 are graphs of the slope values along the north and south shores of the reservoir.

The north shore of Watana Reservoir will be 67.1 miles (108 km) in length and the south shore 51.5 miles (83 km) in length. Jay Creek area lies between 38.8 - 45.1 miles (62.5 - 72.5 km) on the north shore and 18.6 - 28 miles (30 - 45 km) on the south shore. The Oshetna River is at






Figure 3. % slope vs. distance along the north shore. The two crossing areas of Jay Creek and Oshetna River are marked on the graphs both where they flow into the proposed reservoir and on the opposite shore. It should be noted that the scale map from which these slopes were taken would not show features such as a small gully which could enable caribou to negotiate easily an area that the graphs indicate would be difficult.

Figure 4. % slope vs. distance along south shore of Watana Reservoir.





65 - 67.1 miles (104.5 - 108 km) on the north shore and 47.8 - 51.6 miles (77 - 83 km) on the south shore. It appears that the two areas have little in common and must be considered separately as caribou crossings.

Realistic assessment of the effects of ice shelving requires consideration of both caribou behavior and ice conditions. With regard to the ice conditions, the greatest need is for a realistic model of the formation, growth and decay of the reservoir ice cover. Some questions that should be addressed are: What are the shore conditions or slope values that may cause the settling ice cover to break, leaving cracks in which caribou could be injured or possibly trapped? What is the timing of this settling, cracking and snow cover development that might mask the cracks? The thickness of the settling ice cover will increase through the winter but what will the thickness distribution be? Will the wind keep the ice clear of snow? What are the maximum slopes of clear ice and snow-covered ice that caribou can negotiate? How long will the ice shelves remain after breakup, and will caribou be forced to negotiate melting (wet) ice shelves?

During the spring caribou migration, the reservoir may still be frozen in the Jay Creek area, where the caribou will be coming from the north down a slope that varies from 109% to 21.5% with much of the shore between 40 - 60% slope. Probably the only problems the caribou would have getting down this shore would be falling into cracks formed as the ice sheet settles or breaking through the areas where the ice has bridged gaps. The south bank has a slope that varies from 109% to 9.0%, with much of the shore between 30 - 60% slope, so it is possible the caribou would have trouble climbing out on the south side.

The breakup dates of Jay and Kosina Creeks would also be important. If these two creeks break up before the caribou try to cross, there could be water flowing on top of the reservoir ice, and melted areas formed at the mouths of the creeks. An overflow, by itself, would probably cause no problems unless it cut a channel through the ice. Then the caribou might have trouble climbing out on the floating ice cover after swimming or walking through the overflow.

In the Oshetna River area these same questions need to be answered, but the situation is a little different. The slope on the north shore varies from 53.8% to 6.8% and on the south shore from 35.9% to 6.8%, so both shores have a more gradual slope than do those at Jay Creek. This area may be affected by the breakup of the Tyone River as well as the Oshetna River. For 3.7 miles (6 km) upstream of the Oshetna River, the draw-down of the reservoir may leave an ice sheet on the river bed and flood plain. When the Tyone River breaks up, water will be flowing into this ice-covered area. The actual effect is unknown but there could be ice jams and/or ice chunks floating in the area which would make it difficult or impossible for caribou to cross.

In conclusion, it seems likely that the reservoir will cause the caribou some problems, but the seriousness of the problems cannot be realistically assessed until more information has been gathered on caribou behavior and on the ice conditions in the reservoir.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Geophysical Institute acknowledges with thanks the assistance of the Department of Community & Regional

Affairs, State of Alaska, and the United States Government, Department of Labor, for providing funding for the labor on this report under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act.

We also wish to thank Dr. D. Klein, University of Alaska; Mr. Jim Davis, Department of Fish and Game, Fairbanks; and Mr. Sterling Eide, Department of Fish and Game, Glenallen, for information on caribou behavior.

REFERENCES

- ¹ Klein, D. 1971. Reaction of reindeer to obstructions and disturbances. *Science* July 30, Vol. 173, pp. 393 - 398.
- ² U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. 1975. Draft Environmental Impact Statement, Southcentral Railbelt Area; Hydroelectric Power Development, Upper Susitna River Basin, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Alaska District, Anchorage, Alaska.
- ³ Eide, Sterling. 1979. Personal communication.
- ⁴ *Ibid.*

....

Janice Hanscom received her B.S. in Biology from the University of Maine at Orono. She has been a technician for Dr. T. Osterkamp for the last year.

T.E. Osterkamp is Associate Professor of Physics, Geophysical Institute, University of Alaska, Fairbanks. His interests lie in the scientific aspects of environmental and engineering problems involving snow and ice, including permafrost and frozen ground.

Nelchina Basin Moose and Caribou Harvest 1974-75 through 1976-77

<u>MOOSE</u>	<u>Nelchina Total</u>	<u>Statewide Total</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1974-75	794	7,482	10.6
1975-76	715	3,286	21.8
1976-77	732	4,067	18.0
 <u>CARIBOU</u>			
1974-75	669	2,727 + Western Arctic ≈ 25-30,000	
1975-76	776	3,129	24.8
1976-77	360	3,192	11.3

APPENDIX I

Moose Movements and Habitat Use
Along the Upper Susitna River--A Preliminary Study of
Potential Impacts of the Devils
Canyon Hydroelectric Project

by
Kenton P. Taylor
and
Warren B. Ballard

Alaska Department of Fish and Game
Division of Game

Robert A. Hinman, Acting Director

March 1978

CONTENTS

Summary	37
Background.	38
Description of Area	40
Procedures.	40
Findings	42
Numbers of Moose Captured.	42
Movements.	44
Devil Mountain Area	44
Watana Creek.	44
Susitna Bend Area	49
Maclaren River Area	52
Habitat Use.	52
Discussion.	55
Conclusions	58
Recommendations	59
Acknowledgements.	59
Literature Cited.	61

SUMMARY

During October 1976 and March 1977, 18 radio collars and 21 visual collars were placed on moose along the Susitna River from the mouth of the Maclaren River downstream to Devil Creek. Radio tracking flights over 13 months yielded 270 observations of radio-collared moose. Visual collars were located 43 times. Movements were slight for radio-collared moose between Jay Creek and Devil Mountain, generally within 48 km². One visual collar from Devil Creek was seen near Lone Butte, 84 km east of her tagging location. Movements of moose collared east of Jay Creek were substantially longer, and migrations up to 103 km were observed. Radio-collared moose were found most often (70 percent) in spruce dominated habitats during all seasons. Seven of the eight cows that produced calves gave birth in spruce vegetation. The bend of the Susitna River from Goose Creek to the mouth of Tyone River was identified as important winter habitat for moose from many areas of the Susitna River drainage. Lower elevations along the Susitna River were found to be important as both wintering and calving areas for resident populations, particularly on the south side, east of Stephan Lake. Collared moose crossed the Susitna a minimum of 26 times during this study, 15 of which were across that portion which would be inundated by dam construction.

Movement data gathered over a period of only 13 months are insufficient to accurately delineate separate moose populations. Evidence to date suggests that moose from many portions of the Susitna River drainage utilize habitats adjacent to or portions of the area which will be flooded by dam construction. Intensive vegetative studies and research on movements both upstream and downstream are needed to adequately assess the impacts of the proposed construction (Appendix II).

BACKGROUND


Feasibility studies on providing hydroelectric power from the Susitna River to the railbelt area of southcentral Alaska have been conducted since 1948. Potential dam sites were identified by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, the Alaska Power Administration and the Henry J. Kaiser Company. Proposed hydroelectric projects have included from 2 to 12 dams within the Susitna River basin, along with associated maintenance facilities and transmission lines to Anchorage and Fairbanks (Dept. of Army 1975).

The Devils Canyon-Watana dam system has been selected by the Army Corps of Engineers as the most viable of several alternatives (Fig. 1). This system would theoretically provide 6.1 billion kilowatt-hours of electrical power annually from a dependable capacity of 1,568 megawatts (Army Corps of Engineers 1975). The Devils Canyon dam would be a concrete structure 193 m high, and the Watana dam would be a rock fill impoundment rising 247 m above the river bottom. A 103-km road from Chulitna to the Watana site including a 198-m bridge across the Sustina would be constructed for transporting materials and personnel to the dam sites. Five hundred eighty-six km of transmission line corridors, 57-64 m wide, would be cut across the mountains between Anchorage and Fairbanks. Warehouses, vehicle storage buildings and permanent living quarters would be erected at the dam sites. The total projected cost of completing this project is \$2,100,000,000 (Army Corps of Engineers 1977). The estimated annual cost for operation for 100 years following completion is \$104,000,000. Power on the line from the Watana site is scheduled for 1986 and from the Devils Canyon dam by 1990. Construction and maintenance of this system would constitute the largest hydro-power project in North America (Gravel 1977).

Construction of both proposed dam sites would inundate 51,000 acres of the river valley, 132 km upstream to a point between the Tyone and Oshetna Rivers (Fish and Wildl. Ser. 1975). Water levels of the Devils Canyon reservoir are expected to remain almost constant but may fluctuate up to 55 m (ob. cit.). The Watana reservoir is projected to have substantial seasonal fluctuations up to 78 m. Downstream flow is expected to be maintained at a constant rate between 8,000 and 10,000 cubic feet per second, eliminating the flooding action that presently occurs each spring when downstream flows may be as high as 90,000 cfs (Army Corps of Engineers 1975).

The Susitna River Basin has long been recognized as an extremely rugged wilderness area of high esthetic appeal and as an important habitat to a wide variety of wildlife species (ADF&G, unpubl. data). Most important to sport and subsistence users are moose (*Alces alces*) and caribou (*Rangifer tarandus*). Hydroelectric development has been under consideration in this area for a number of years and some very general ungulate population assessment work was begun in 1974 (USF&W 1975). Since then no studies were conducted in the project area until 1976 when limited funds were made available to begin acquiring baseline information on moose and caribou populations within and adjacent to the project area. The purpose of this report is to present the findings of this one-year study and to discuss their implications in relation to the construction of the proposed hydroelectric project.

Figure 1. Devils Canyon Proposed Hydroelectric Project Moose Movement Study Area. Devils Canyon Project, March 1978.



DESCRIPTION OF AREA

Moose movements and habitat use were studied in that portion of the Susitna River Basin lying between latitudes 60°30' - 63°15' north and longitudes 146°30' - 149° west (Figure 1). The landscape is primarily mountainous and ranges in elevation from 300 to 1900 m. Semi-arid conditions dominate this area of the basin. Temperatures are generally cool in the summer and overcast days are common. Snowfall is usually moderate and ground accumulation does not often exceed one meter. Prevailing winds are out of the east and north. High winds are common along the river during any season.

Along the banks of the Susitna and its tributaries from the Maclaren River to Devil Creek the dominant vegetative cover is black spruce (*Picea mariana*), interspersed with muskeg bogs on the basin floor. Occasional stands of black cottonwood (*Populus trichocarpa*) are found on the islands in the river. Understory vegetation in the lower elevations includes highbush cranberry (*Viburnum edule*), devil's club (*Echinopanax horridus*), blueberry (*Vaccinium* spp.), lowbush cranberry (*Vaccinium vitis-idaea*) and several representatives of the rose and grass families. Hardwoods such as aspen (*Populus tremuloides*) and birch (*Betula papyrifera*) are often found interspersed among the spruce, predominantly on south-facing slopes. White spruce (*Picea glauca*) replaces the smaller, stunted black spruce on better drained soils. The understory above 300 m contains blueberry, lowbush cranberry, Labrador tea (*Ledum* spp.), fireweed (*Epilobium* spp.), crowberry (*Empetrum nigrum*), and several mosses and lichens.

Alder (*Alnus* spp.) dominates the reaches just above timberline, particularly along the headwaters of streams. Willow (*Salix* spp.) exists throughout the study area but occurs most frequently at timberline and on riparian sites. Alpine tundra extends above the alder-willow zone about 1200 m. A network of old caribou trails scars the tundra slopes of the mountain foothills throughout most of the area.

PROCEDURES

During October 1976 and March 1977, moose were captured along the Susitna River from its confluence with the Maclaren River downstream to Devil Creek. They were darted from a Bell Jet Ranger helicopter using standard techniques described by Franzmann et al. (1974) with doses of Anectine (Succinylcholine chloride), ranging from 23 to 29 mg. All captured moose were marked with plastic flagging affixed with metal ear tags and with either a radio collar, visual collar, or both. Radio collars were manufactured by AVM Instrument Company (Champaign, Illinois). These collars weighed 1.1 kg and were constructed of machine belting 13 mm thick and 65 mm wide with an adjustable inner circumference of 101 to 106 cm. The belting surrounded the radio components which were encased in dental acrylic, making the unit waterproof. Each radio was equipped with a SB-2 transmitter powered by cold resistant lithium batteries. All radios operated on frequencies between 150.700 and 151.875 MHz. Each visual collar (as described by Franzmann et al. 1974) had three sets of numerals, one on top and one on each side, to facilitate identification from the air. Visual collars were placed over many of the

Figure 2. Survey form used to record data during radio tracking flights along the Susitna River. Devils Canyon Project, 1978.

SUSITNA STUDY

MOOSE RADIO OBSERVATION FORM

Observer:

Weather:

Time off:

Temp.:

Time On:

Radio #	Channel	Seen	Calves	Location	Vegetation	Notes
8583	4-7-4.0					
8584	4-8-2.0					
8586	4-10-3.2					
8589	4-12-3.0					
8580	4-6-2.0					
8038	4-3-2.8					
8573	2-9-3.5					
8576	3-6-0.0					
8022	1-4-2.5					
8588	4-12-2.4					
8040	4-11-.5					
8578	4-4-3.9					
8579	4-5-1.9					
8051	3-8-2.5					
8035	3-12-1.4					
8018	1-2-3.8					
8030	3-7-1.5					
8575	2-12-4.2					

radios to enable observers to more easily pick out the radio-collared individual from a group of moose.

When conditions permitted, a lower front incisor was removed from each moose for age analysis using techniques developed by Sargent and Pimlott (1959). Blood and hair samples also were collected to aid in assessing physiological condition using methods described by Franzmann et al. (1975). Several physical measurements were taken when time permitted and general physical condition was assessed according to criteria developed by Franzmann and Arneson (1973). Cows captured in March were rectally palpated using techniques described by Greer and Hawkins (1967) to determine pregnancy.

Radio tracking flights were made monthly in a Piper PA-18 Supercub equipped with two three-element Yagi antennas connected to a four band, 12 channel portable receiver manufactured by AVM Instrument Company. Tracking methods were similar to those described by Mech (1974). Radio locations, vegetation type and miscellaneous notes were recorded for each observation (Fig. 2). During parturition, flights were increased to approximately every 3 to 5 days to more adequately assess initial production and survival of calves.

FINDINGS

Numbers of Moose Captured

Thirty-nine moose were captured and collared during October 1976 and March 1977 along the Susitna River in the vicinity of that portion of the river which would be inundated by the construction of the proposed dams at Devils Canyon and Watana Creek. Although the 13 moose collared in October were not originally part of this study, the data from these animals are included in this report. Collaring location and other pertinent tagging statistics are summarized in Table 1. Eighteen moose were fitted with radio transmitters and 21 wore numbered visual collars only. Twenty-seven incisor teeth were collected during the collaring operation, and cementum layer analysis indicated the average age for females was 6.7 years with a range from 2 to 13 years. Yearlings were generally avoided during the collaring operation. Of 21 females palpated, 18 were pregnant (85.7 percent).

Blood and physical measurement data were combined with those from other moose studies and were presented elsewhere (Ballard and Taylor, in prep.). Briefly, the pooled blood parameters tested were very comparable to values obtained from other studies of populations considered to be in good condition. Some parameters tested (hemoglobin and packed cell volume) from the Devil Mountain area were lower than those from the other tagging sites, but it is not known if those differences were statistically significant since no tests have as yet been performed.

A total of 270 observations were recorded for 18 radio-collared moose between late October 1975 and mid November 1977. One radio-collared moose was found dead two weeks after collaring. The cause of death was undetermined; we suspect, however, that it was drug related.

Table 1. Date, location and general information of female moose radio and visual collared along the Susitna River. Devils Canyon Project, 1978.

Collar Number	Collaring Date	Location	Anectine Dosage	Cementum Age (years)	Condition*	Pregnant**
8583	3/18/77	E. of Devil Mtn.	27 mg.	4	6	No
8584	3/18/77	E. of Devil Mtn.	25 mg.	-	6	Yes
8586	3/18/77	Devil Mtn.	23 mg.	10	4	Yes
8589	3/18/77	E. of Devil Mtn.	27 mg.	-	-	No
8580	3/18/77	Devil Mtn.	23 mg.	-	-	--
8038	10/27/76	Watana	-- --	9	-	--
8573	3/19/77	Susitna-Watana	27 mg.	-	7	Yes
8576	3/19/77	Susitna-Watana	28 mg.	8	6	--
8022	10/28/76	Upper Watana	29 mg.	10	7	--
8588	3/19/77	Upper Jay Creek	29 mg.	8	7	--
8040	10/28/76	Upper Watana	29 mg.	-	7	--
8578	3/20/77	Susitna-Tyone	27 mg.	2	5	No
8579	3/20/77	Susitna-Tyone	25 mg.	3	6	Yes
8031	10/22/76	S. Bend-Susitna	27 mg.	-	7	--
8035	10/27/76	S. MacLaren Flats	-- --	-	7	--
8018	10/27/76	Butte Creek	29 mg.	2	6	--
8030	10/22/76	W. of Ballard L.	25 mg.	6	6	--
8575	3/21/77	Lower Maclaren	29 mg.	11	7	Yes
2 Blue	10/22/76	N. Oshetna R.	-- --	9	-	--
4 Blue	10/22/76	Susitna-Tyone	-- --	4	-	--
5 Blue	10/22/76	Susitna-Tyone	27 mg.	6	7	--
6 Blue	10/22/76	Susitna-Tyone	27 mg.	5	-	--
7 Blue	10/22/76	Susitna-Tyone	25 mg.	6	-	--
71 Blue	10/28/76	Jay Creek	29 mg.	3	-	--
50 Blue	3/22/77	Lower Maclaren R.	27 mg.	8	6	Yes
51 Blue	3/22/77	Lower Maclaren R.	25 mg.	3	6	Yes
52 Blue	3/22/77	Lower Maclaren R.	27 mg.	7	7	Yes
53 Blue	3/22/77	Lower Maclaren R.	27 mg.	-	5	Yes
54 Blue	3/22/77	Lower Maclaren R.	25 mg.	4	-	Yes
56 Blue	3/22/77	Lower Maclaren R.	27 mg.	7	7	Yes
58 Blue	3/22/77	Lower Maclaren R.	27 mg.	12	7	Yes
60 Blue	3/20/77	Susitna N. of Tyone	28 mg.	13	-	--
61 Blue	3/20/77	Susitna N. of Tyone	25 mg.	-	7	Yes
63 Blue	3/20/77	Susitna Bend	27 mg.	5	7	Yes
64 Blue	3/20/77	Susitna Bend	27 mg.	11	7	Yes
75 White	3/19/77	Jay Creek	28 mg.	-	-	Yes
79 White	3/19/77	Jay Creek	28 mg.	-	-	--
80 White	3/18/77	E. Devil Mtn.	25 mg.	4	-	Yes
81 White	3/18/77	E. Devil Mtn.	27 mg.	-	7	Yes

*Condition was determined by general appearance and relative amount of fat over rump and ribs. Scale of 1-10, 10= excellent. See Franzmann et al. (1974) for criteria.

**Only cows collared in March and palpated are included in this column.

Another moose was lost from the sample when we were unable to relocate it after one month of tracking. Its loss was attributed to a faulty transmitter.

Movements

Radio-collared moose occupied areas ranging from 21 km² to 520 km² (Table 2). Significantly smaller areas were occupied in the rugged terrain between Jay Creek and Devils Canyon than east of Jay Creek where the terrain becomes more open and level. The correlation between the number of sightings and size of range for each moose was $r = 0.50$. Observed locations and detailed movements of each radio-collared moose are presented in Appendix I. A brief description of radio-collared moose movements follows.

Devil Mountain Area: Three moose (#s 8583, 8584 and 8586) were radio-collared on Devils Mountain on 18 March 1977, approximately 3 km north of the Susitna River (Fig. 3). All three remained in the vicinity of their tagging location until spring when #8583 moved 8 km east. Both #8584 and #8586 remained on their winter range through April. At the end of May, during the peak of calving, #8584 and #8586 were located 10-11 km to the southeast on the other side of the Susitna River within 2 km of each other. Three days later #8584 was seen with two new calves and #8586 was seen with one. Number 8583 was not pregnant when palpated in March. She remained on the north side of the river within a 3 km radius of her April location. Number 8586 lost her calf within two weeks and remained through the fall within 6 km of her calving location. Moose #8584 lost one calf within the first two weeks and the other prior to the first week in July. She was found on the north side of the river on 28 June and on the south side on 5 July where she remained through the fall. All three moose remained at elevations below 950 m during the time they were monitored. Some seasonal fluctuation in elevation occurred just prior to calving as #8584 and #8586 moved down from the south facing slope of the riverbank and crossed the river to calve. Seasonal home ranges for all three moose appeared to be small, probably not in excess of 20 km².

Watana Creek Area: Three radios were placed on cows along upper Watana Creek in October. Two of these females, #8040 (Fig. 4) and #8022 (Fig. 5), were collared together. Both moved to lower elevations as winter progressed and remained there until June. Number 8040 was seen with twins on 8 June but on 16 June the calves were missing and were never seen again. The cow returned to upper Watana Creek and remained within a 2 km radius throughout the fall. Number 8022 traveled considerably farther than #8040 as she crossed the Susitna sometime in February and returned in March. On 1 June she was seen in the same vicinity as #8040 on lower Watana Creek. On 16 June they were again found in close proximity. Her movements indicated no distinct migration between winter and summer ranges. Number 8022 was never seen with a calf. During the calving season she was found in four different locations.

Number 8038 was collared 5 km south of Big Lake. During all 19 observations this moose was between 600 m and 950 m elevation (Fig. 4). Although she was observed with a new calf on 26 May, when checked again

Table 2. Range size, number of locations and minimum number of river crossings of radio-collared moose along the Susitna River. Devils Canyon Project, 1978.

<u>Collar Number</u>	<u>Number of Locations</u>	<u>Range Length km.</u>	<u>Range Width km.</u>	<u>Total Area km²</u>	<u>Minimum number of river crossings</u>
8583	12	11.6	4.8	30.9	0
8584	12	17.7	4.5	37.3	3
8586	10	17.7	5.3	30.9	1
8589	2	--	--	--	--
8580	3	--	--	--	--
8038	19	14.2	9.3	51.5	0
8573	14	14.8	7.9	47.6	2
8576	12	6.9	6.4	20.6	0
8022	18	24.8	17.2	180.2	1
8588	11	13.5	8.2	39.9	1*
8040	19	17.1	6.4	49.9	0
8578	17	14.3	5.5	32.2	1
8579	10	30.6	11.9	173.2	2
8031	26	16.1	12.1	74.7	0
8035	23	62.3	14.0	373.4	0
8018	18	65.0	18.7	520.1	2
8030	24	55.5	21.2	415.8	2
8575	<u>20</u>	103.0	10.5	<u>291.4</u>	<u>0</u>
270 Total		Ave. range size 148.1 km ²			15 Total

* Cow observed on island.

Correlation between number of sightings and size of range for each moose =0.50.

Figure 3. Location and General Range Size for Radio-Collared Moose Along the Susitna River near Devil Mountain. Devils Canyon Project, March 1978.




Figure 4. Location and General Range of Radio-Collared Moose Numbers 8038, 8040 and 8573 Along Watana Creek. Devils Canyon Project, March 1978.





Figure 5. Location and General Range of Radio-Collared Moose Numbers 8022, 8576 and 8588 Along Watana Creek. Devils Canyon Project, March 1978.



on 31 May the calf was missing. From June through fall she appeared to move constantly, and the range used throughout this period overlapped that of winter observations.

On 19 March three females (#s 8573, 8576 and 8588) were collared on the north side of the Susitna between Watana and Jay Creeks. Number 8576 moved less extensively than any of the other radio-collared females (Fig. 5). She was observed 12 times, all on the north side of the river within an area of approximately 28 km². When last observed on 30 November she was within 2 km of her tagging location. Female #8588 also wintered along the north bank of the Susitna. She moved to an island in the river in early June and was observed again on the north bank on 8 June where she remained through November (Fig. 5). Number 8573 wintered along the north shore of the Susitna and crossed to the south bank during calving season (Fig. 4). She was never observed with a calf, although it was determined that she was pregnant when collared. However, she was not visually observed between 26 May and 3 June. She remained on the south side of the river until July when she returned to her collaring location. She stayed there until 30 November when, after a moderate snowfall, she moved to lower elevations near the mouth of Watana Creek.

Susitna Bend Area: Movements were more extensive for those moose collared east of Jay Creek. Number 8031 was collared in October 1976 on the north side of the Susitna near the mouth of the Tyone River. Two others, numbers 8578 and 8579, were collared in the same vicinity in March 1977. Number 8031 was observed almost exclusively between 600 m and 950 m in spruce habitats along the north and west banks of the Susitna (Fig. 6). She was never observed on the south bank of the river. She had a calf when tagged which survived the winter, but she was never observed with a calf the following spring. No seasonal range preference is discernible from her movement pattern.

Number 8579 was once found 30 km from where she was collared (Fig. 6). She wintered along the Susitna and crossed to the mouth of Goose Creek in May. She returned to the north side and moved to higher elevations near the headwaters of Coal Creek during calving where she remained through November. She was not located during June and was not observed with a calf in July, although it had been determined in March that she was pregnant. She remained in the high country through November.

Cow #8578 wintered in the same vicinity as 8579 and then crossed the Susitna to the mouth of the Oshetna River (Fig. 6). She never returned to the north side and spent the remaining summer months and fall in an area of approximately 7 km², west of the mouth of Goose Creek. Number 8578 was not pregnant when collared in March.

Number 8030 was collared very close to numbers 8031, 8578 and 8579, but her movement patterns were totally dissimilar (Fig. 7). She moved south across the Susitna River and wintered along the drainage of the Tyone River. By 10 May she had moved 2 km to an island in Susitna Lake and was observed there with a calf on 30 May. She remained with her calf through August in the vicinity of Tyone Village and returned on 5 October to within 1 km of her collaring location.

8031, 8578 and 8579 Downstream from the MacLaren River. Devils Canyon Project, March 1978.





Figure 7. Location and General Range of Radio-collared Moose Numbers 8030 and 8575 Southeast from the Maclaren and Susitna Rivers. Devils Canyon Project, March 1978.



Maclaren River Area: Two females, numbers 8035 and 8575, were collared along the Maclaren River. Number 8035, collared on 27 October 1976, moved 59 km during November and early December to the mouth of the Oshetna River where she remained through March (Fig. 8). On 22 April she was observed returning to the vicinity of her tagging location. She was observed on several occasions in this area without a calf throughout the summer and fall. By 22 November she had returned to the mouth of the Oshetna River, 50 km from her previous location. During April 1977, #8575 migrated 103 km, the longest movement recorded during this study, from the lower Maclaren River to Sucker Lake south of the Glenn Highway near Tazlina Lake (Fig. 7). She was pregnant when collared in March but was never observed with a calf. This moose remained near Sucker Lake through May and moved 11 km north to Tolsona Ridge during June where she spent most of July and August. She returned once to Sucker Lake and made one trip to Lost Cabin Lake, but both times moved back to Tolsona Ridge. On 30 September she was observed moving back towards her tagging location on the Maclaren. By 5 October she had returned 82 km and was within 9 km of her collaring location.


Female #8018 was collared in October along Butte Creek. She was accompanied by a calf and remained in the Butte Creek vicinity through January (Fig. 9). On 7 February she and her calf were observed across the Susitna, 43 km away on the north side of Kelley Lake. She wintered there with her calf and began moving up the Maclaren in April. On 30 May she was seen with a new calf which was observed until 10 June. By 12 July she had returned 30 km in the direction of her tagging location and remained in the same vicinity she had inhabited the previous fall through November.


Radio-collared moose movement data were supplemented somewhat by incidental observations of visually-collared moose. Eleven additional river crossings were documented and possible migratory directions were identified. The second longest movement during this study occurred when the moose wearing visual collar number 80 was found near Lone Butte, 84 km southeast of her tagging location at Devils Mountain. Of the moose collared west of Jay Creek, she alone showed any migratory movement of significant distance. Collar number 60 was tagged in March 1977 just north of the mouth of Tyone Creek and was found 78 km to the northwest between the Nenana River and West Fork Glacier in August. One moose, #10, collared along Butte Creek in October 1976 moved down Watana Creek to the Susitna where she was found in August. Another, #67, was collared near Susitna Lodge in March 1977 and was located in November at the headwaters of Jay Creek.

Habitat Use

Habitat types being utilized by collared moose were noted during radio-tracking flights, and observations were categorized in nine groups (Table 3). Because spruce is the dominant vegetation over much of the study area and is widely variable in density, three categories were used to describe it. One hundred and seventy-two habitat observations of radio-collared moose were noted during tracking flights. Seventy percent of all observations were in spruce dominated habitats. Moose were most

Figure 8. Location and General Range of Radio-Collared Moose Number 8035 along the MacLaren and Susitna Rivers.





radio-tracking flights, and observations were categorized in nine groups (Table 3). Because spruce is the dominant vegetation over much of the study area and is widely variable in density, three categories were used to describe it. One hundred and seventy-two habitat observations of radio-collared moose were noted during tracking flights. Seventy percent of all observations were in spruce dominated habitats. Moose were most often (29.7 percent of observations) found in medium spruce areas where trees ranged from six to 15 m high in stands of moderate density.

Calving occurred primarily in open spruce areas, most often at lower elevations where stands of trees 4 to 14 m high were interspersed with openings. Eight calves, including one set of twins, were born in spruce habitats while one cow gave birth to a set of twins in alder dominated habitat. Alder and willow areas at and above timberline were utilized during the rutting season until late in the fall when snow depths approached 1 m.

Between Devil Creek and Watana Creek, radio-collared moose remained throughout the year almost exclusively at the lower spruce dominated elevations. Moose collared along upper Watana Creek were observed more often in willow-alder communities except during late winter when they were generally found in spruce habitats at lower elevations.

DISCUSSION

Movement patterns of moose are highly variable. Studies throughout North America (Edwards and Ritcey 1956, Houston 1968, Goddard 1970, LeResche 1972) support the hypothesis that movement patterns in moose may range from being sedentary to seasonal migrations of great distances. Peterson (1955) believed that many moose spend their whole lives in an area of 32-800 km². This appears to be true for many of the moose in the Susitna study area. Nine of the 16 moose radio-collared and tracked for 13 months along the Susitna River occupied areas smaller than 52 km². All but one of these were collared west of Jay Creek where the river valley is fairly narrow and is surrounded by mountains.

LeResche (1974) found that home range seldom exceeds 5-10 km² during a given season. Because radio-collared moose were only monitored for 8 to 13 months during this study, data were inadequate to allow computation of seasonal home range sizes. It was noticed, however, that several of the radio-collared moose were found repeatedly in areas less than 10 km² in extent. Others appeared to be more nomadic, particularly those collared in the eastern portion of the study area where they wandered across areas up to 50 km² during the spring and summer.

Areas of low elevation are often inhabited by both migratory and nonmigratory moose during winter and spring (LeResche 1972). This was apparent in the Devil Mountain area where #80 was collared. Between March and September 1977 she moved a straight line distance of 84 km to the southeast while a cow collared at the same time in the same location remained within 1.1 km of her collaring site throughout the year. This was also true of the wintering area between the Tyone River and Goose Creek to which many moose migrated considerable distances. Number 8031 remained in this area throughout the 13 months of this study.

Table 3. Number of observations of radio-collared moose in vegetation types along the Susitna River between October 1976 and December 1977. Devils Canyon Project, 1978.

<u>Collar Number</u>	<u>Total Sightings</u>	<u>Open Spruce*</u>	<u>Medium Spruce</u>	<u>Dense Spruce</u>	<u>Spruce/ Hardwood**</u>	<u>Alpine Tundra</u>	<u>Alder</u>	<u>Willow</u>	<u>Riparian Willow</u>	<u>Open</u>
8583	10	4	2	1	3					
8584	9	5	2	1	1					
8586	7	3	4							
8589	1			1						
8580	2		1	1						
8038	13	5	4	1		1			1	1
8573	10		6	1	1		1	1		
8576	12	3	8				1			
8022	8	1	2				3	1	1	
8588	9	2	3	1			1	2		
8040	10	1					6	1	2	
8578	12	6		1	1	2	1	1		
8579	9	1	1	2	1	2		1	1	
8031	11	1	7	2				1		
8035	12	3	3	1		1		1	3	
8018	11	3	2			1	2	2	1	
8030	11	2	3	6						
8575	15	3	3	7			1		1	
	<u>172</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>51</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>1</u>
Percent of Total	100.0	25.0	29.7	15.1	4.1	4.1	9.3	6.4	5.8	.6

*Spruce categories include both white spruce (*Picea glauca*) and black spruce (*Picea mariana*).

**Hardwoods in this category include aspen (*Populus tremuloides*) and birch (*Betula papyrifera*).

Edwards and Ritcey (1956) noted that increasing snow depths above timberline triggered moose migrations out of the high country to their wintering areas in the lowlands. Their observations have been supported in Alaska by Rausch (1958) and LeResche (1974), both of whom concluded that the fall migration in Interior Alaska is closely related to snow conditions. Snow depths along the Susitna River during the winter of 1976-77 were below normal until late March. They appeared to be greater along the eastern portion of the study area than west of Jay Creek. Shortly after accumulated snow reached its maximum depths, most collared moose east of Jay Creek either migrated short distances where a considerable drop in elevation was possible, or made long treks to their wintering areas, gradually moving to lower elevations. Except for #80, those west of Jay Creek showed no tendency to migrate at all. Radio-collared moose in this area may be representative of a sedentary population, but it is recognized that data collections over a 13-month period which includes subnormal snow depths are inadequate to accurately assess the migratory nature of moose along this stretch of the Susitna River. If data from this small sample are representative of the moose population currently inhabiting this stretch of the Susitna River, construction of the Devils Canyon dam would have a highly detrimental effect on the population as the dam would inundate a major portion of the winter habitat presently available. Destruction of this winter range would substantially reduce the carrying capacity of a major portion of the Devil Creek drainages.

Some of the possible migratory routes represented by data accumulated thus far are illustrated in Figures 3-9. The relative significance of each of these is unknown at this time, although it is apparent that a substantial number of moose migrate to and utilize the area near the mouth of the Tyone and the Oshetna Rivers for winter range. Coady (1974) noted that the depth, density and hardness of snow are appreciably lower in coniferous and deciduous tree communities making them more favorable to moose under stress from severe winter snow conditions. The lower, spruce-covered reaches of the Watana Creek Valley are probably critical for the majority of moose inhabiting this area during a severe winter. A major portion of this area would be inundated by construction of the Watana dam. Additional observations of moose during normal or severe winter conditions are necessary to determine the importance of this area as winter range. If this area is used as winter range during more severe winters which would normally occur in this area, construction of the Watana Dam would substantially reduce the carrying capacity of this portion of the study area.

Present information indicates moose depend heavily upon the river bottoms and adjacent areas for winter habitat both above and below the Watana and Devils Canyon damsites. Lack of adequate wintering areas in the lower Susitna Valley has been a major limiting factor to moose population growth there in the past (Chatelain 1951). Most existing winter range is along the major rivers where periodic flooding has caused rechanneling of the main stream, allowing riparian willow to colonize the dry stream beds. Regulating the flow of water from the dam at Devils Canyon could have a highly detrimental effect on growth of riparian vegetation downstream to the mouth of the Susitna. It is possible that maintaining a steady flow of 8,000 to 10,000 cu. ft./sec.

from the Devils Canyon dam would effectively prevent the flooding activity that presently occurs periodically. This could create a short-term abundance of winter range along the riverbanks that might last 30 or more years. The net long-term effect could well be a negative one, however, as it is suspected that the present natural flooding activity of the Susitna River produces favorable conditions for browse production. Without annual floods, these riparian areas could become mature stands of hardwoods after 25 or 30 years and provide little or no winter forage. Research on riparian vegetation habitat types and associated moose usage downstream of dam construction is essential to determine potential impacts on moose populations.

CONCLUSIONS

The emphasis of this telemetry study focused almost exclusively on the north side of the Susitna River upstream from the Devils Canyon dam site. Information on migratory routes and annual movement patterns was limited by the small sample of radio-collared moose (18), many of which were observed for less than nine months. Moose which were collared in October 1976 were monitored through the winter of 1976-77 which was considered to be mild. Information pertinent to identifying critical wintering areas is most appropriately obtained during winters of high to severe snow depths because moose tend to congregate in greater densities on the most vital ranges as snow depths increase. Acquisition of moose movement information downstream and on the south side of the Susitna River is essential to evaluation of the full effects of the proposed hydroelectric project. Downstream effects on moose would be expected to be significant since vegetation composition would be altered substantially as a result of regulated water flow.

Annual moose harvests within the immediate drainages along the upstream portion of the Sustina River have averaged 146 moose since 1974 (ADF&G, unpublished data). Approximately 475-500 sportsmen participate in moose hunts in this area each fall (ob. cit.). How significantly dam construction might reduce or increase this level of activity is difficult to project with the limited data available. Construction of an access road to the Watana site would substantially increase hunter pressure in the area, creating a corresponding increase in total man days spent hunting. In the long run, however, the quality of the hunting experience would probably decline, along with the rate of hunter success. Dam construction and maintenance schedules are projected on a basis of a dam life of 100 years. If impacts of the project reduced local moose populations by 50 percent this would amount to a corresponding loss of harvest of 7,300 moose during the life of the dam.

Construction of the Devils Canyon dam would flood a 45 km portion of the Susitna River having a surface area of 7,500 acres (USF&WS, 1975). The riverbanks along this portion of the river are generally steep and provide marginal habitat for moose. The low density of moose tracks in this area throughout winter 1977-78 indicates that little utilization occurs during winters of moderate snowfall. Since water levels in the Devils Canyon reservoir are expected to remain fairly constant, low mortality rates associated with ice shelving and steep mud banks would be expected.

Construction of the Watana dam would result in inundation of 43,000 acres along Watana Creek and the Susitna River. Approximately 35,000 acres sustain moderate to heavy utilization by moose during an average winter (USF&WS 1975). Much of it supports moderate moose densities during the spring and summer seasons as well. The preliminary movement data gathered thus far from radio-collared moose indicate that moose from several surrounding areas of the Susitna Basin migrate across or utilize this portion of the river during some period of the year. The Alaska Department of Fish and Game recorded observations of 2,037 moose during their fall 1977 sex and age composition counts of these areas (ADF&G, unpublished data). LeResche and Rausch (1974) concluded that an observer generally sees between 43 to 68 percent of the moose in an area during an aerial census. Using 50 percent to extrapolate roughly, the resident population utilizing this portion of the basin probably is between 4,000 and 5,000 moose. Random stratified counts weighted with an accurate sightability index are needed to accurately assess numbers of moose in this area.

Effects of the construction of the Watana dam on these moose populations could be substantial. The resident nonmigratory segment of the population could be eliminated. The immediate loss of a major portion of the winter range along Watana Creek and parts of the Susitna River to flooding would have the effect of reducing the carrying capacity of the habitat at higher elevations used only during the warm seasons and mild winters. The Watana Reservoir would be 87 km long and may during some seasons prove to be an effective barrier to migrations. The resulting disruption of movements to traditional breeding grounds may adversely impact productivity. Increased mortality of neonates during post calving movements might occur. Since water levels are expected to fluctuate as much as 78 m, ice shelving could become a significant cause of mortality as well. Calving is a common occurrence in these portions of the study area. The loss of calving habitat notwithstanding, fluctuating water levels would convert the presently timbered slopes from the Watana dam site to the Oshetna River to enormous mud banks. Calf mortality from falling down these banks or getting stuck in the mud could become a common occurrence.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Collection of baseline biological data and completion of resource assessment in the area affected by the proposed hydroelectric project in far greater depth than this study are essential prerequisites to understanding the possible impacts of the proposed action. Identification of moose populations, movement patterns, and habitat use downstream and on the south side of the Susitna River is essential to predict both negative and beneficial effects of the proposed project. Habitat studies should be conducted concurrently to determine seasonal use and degree of dependency of populations on habitat to be impacted by the project. Alternate areas suitable for habitat rehabilitation to mitigate range losses should be investigated as well as suitable methods for habitat enhancement.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Several biologists with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game gave

freely of their time and expertise to assist us during the initial phase of this study. Drs. A. Franzmann and T. Bailey from the Moose Research Center participated in the collaring operation, and area biologists S. Eide and T. Spraker provided their assistance during several phases of the study. Technician Tom Balland helped during all phases of field work. A. Cuning constructed figures for this manuscript. We wish to express our gratitude to the air taxi operators (Ken Holland, Rick Halford, Ken Bunch, Al Lee and Vern Loftstead) for their many safe hours of flying and their willingness to modify their aircraft to accommodate our telemetry equipment. We wish to give special thanks to all those whose comments and criticisms helped in the preparation of this manuscript.

LITERATURE CITED

- Alaska District, Army Corps of Engineers. 1975. Hydroelectric power and related purposes for the upper Susitna River Basin. Interim Feasibility Rept., 125 p.
- Alaska District, Army Corps of Engineers. 1977. Plan of study for Susitna hydropower, feasibility analysis. Prepared for the State of Alaska. 297 p.
- Ballard, W.B. and K.P. Taylor (In prep). Upper Susitna River moose population study. Alaska Dept. Fish and Game P-R Proj. Rept. W-17-10, Job 1B-1.20.
- Chatelain, E.F. 1951. Winter range problems of moose in the Susitna Valley. Proc. Alaskan Sci. Conf., 2:343-347.
- Coady, J.W. 1974. Influence of snow on the behavior of moose. Naturaliste Can., 101:417-436.
- Edwards, R.Y. and R.W. Ritcey. 1956. The migrations of a moose herd. J. Mammal. 37(4):486-494.
- Franzmann, A.W., A. Flynn and P.D. Arneson. 1975. Levels of some mineral elements in Alaskan moose hair. J. Wildl. Mgmt. 39(2):374-378.
- Franzmann, A.W., P.D. Arneson, R.E. LeResche and J.L. Davis. 1974. Developing and testing new techniques for moose management. Alaska Dept. Fish and Game P-R Proj. Final Rept., W-17-2, W-17-3, W-17-4, W-17-5 and W-17-6. 54 p. (multilith).
- Franzmann, A.W. and P.D. Arneson. 1973. Moose Research Center studies. Alaska Dept. Fish and Game P-R Proj. Rept., W-17-5. 60 p. (multilith).
- Goddard, J. 1970. Movements of moose in a heavily hunted area of Ontario. J. Wildl. Mgmt. 34(2):439-445.
- Gravel, M. 1977. Tapping Susitna's power. Sen. Mike Gravel Reports to Alaskans. July Newsletter. 4 p.
- Greer, K.R. and W.W. Hawkins. 1967. Determining pregnancy in elk by rectal palpation. J. Wildl. Mgmt., 31:145-149.
- Houston, D.B. 1968. The Shiras moose in Jackson Hole, Wyoming. Grand Teton Nat. Hist. Assoc. Tech. Bull. No. 1. 110 p.
- LeResche, R.E. 1972. Migrations and population mixing of moose on the Kenai Peninsula Alaska. 8th N. Am. Moose Conf. Works., Thunder Bay Ontario. Ont. Minist. Nat. Res., Toronto. 185-207 p.
- LeResche, R.E. 1974. Moose migrations in North America with emphasis on Alaska. Naturaliste Can. 101:393-415.

- LeResche, R. E. and R. A. Rausch. 1974. Accuracy and precision of aerial moose censusing. *J. Wildl. Mgmt.* 38(2):175-182.
- Mech, L. D. 1974. Current Techniques in the study of elusive wilderness carnivores. *Proc. XI Internat. Congress of Game Bio.*, pp. 315-322.
- Peterson, R. L. 1955. North American moose. Univ. Toronto Press, 280 p.
- Rausch, R. A. 1958. Moose management studies. Fed. Aid. Wildl. Restor. Job Completion Rept. Vol 12, Proj. W-3-R-12. Alaska Game Comm. Juneau, 138 p.
- Sargent, D. E. and D. H. Pimlott. 1959. Age determination in moose from sectioned incisor teeth. *J. Wildl. Mgmt.* 23(3):315-321.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1975. Southcentral railbelt area upper Susitna River Basin hydroelectric project two dam plan. U.S. Dept. Interior, Anchorage, AK. 25 p.

APPENDIX II

Wildlife Studies

Introduction

The proposed Susitna Hydropower Project will have impacts on several wildlife species which either reside in the project area, use the area for migration or other seasonal purposes or use habitat downstream which will be altered by the stabilization of water flow. The following individual proposals comprise an integrated program to provide information needed to predict the impacts of the Project on wildlife and to provide a basis for making decisions which might minimize those impacts.

This program will not answer all questions. It is designed to provide an acceptable basis of knowledge in a limited time period using presently available techniques. Emphasis has been placed on species which are likely to be most adversely affected by the project and are of greatest interest to man.

The design, timing, manpower requirements and funding levels of the individual projects have been coordinated for efficiency. No single project can be conducted by itself without considerable change in design and increase in cost. For example the moose study is the core of the entire package. The wolf, wolverine, bear and caribou studies are dependent on the moose study for manpower equipment and logistic support. The moose, habitat mapping and vegetation studies are also dependent on each other as each will influence the design of the others and their results must be compatible for final data analysis. If one project does not produce results at the proper time other projects will be delayed, reducing the quality of information and increasing the overall cost of the program.

Title: Habitat mapping and vegetation studies required for analysis of the effects of the Susitna Hydropower Project on wildlife.

Objectives: To prepare a vegetative type map of areas within and adjacent to proposed impoundments, along transmission corridors and along the downstream floodplain.

To identify key moose browse species and determine the condition and trends of selected moose habitats.

To determine the effects of altered water flow on key plant species and map areas where substantial vegetation changes will occur.

Background: Most impacts of the Susitna Hydropower Project on wildlife will occur through loss or alteration of habitat. Where habitat is totally lost to a population through inundation or blocking of migrations it is necessary to know the importance of that particular habitat to the population and the availability of alternative habitats. Where habitat will be merely altered, it is also necessary to know what elements within that habitat are important to the population and what changes will occur in those elements. Direct studies of wildlife species can

delineate a population and tell us where various components of the population are at different times and to a certain extent why they are there. However, wildlife studies must be accompanied by habitat studies if we are to determine the full significance of habitat alteration to the population.

This project is not an actual proposal. Several of the studies outlined here could be expanded to meet the needs of other disciplines. Therefore, this is a statement of information needed to evaluate the effects of the Susitna Project on wildlife. Actual study proposals should be developed to provide this information on the schedule outlined.

Procedures: A habitat type map of the proposed impoundment areas, all drainages flowing into the impoundments, access and transmission corridors and the downstream floodplain should be prepared during the first two years of the study. This map should be of sufficient detail to permit delineation of specific habitats favored by moose and must be accompanied by sufficient ground truth data to identify the distribution and abundance of moose browse species. In order to accomplish this it is essential that the principal investigators of moose studies work directly with the habitat mappers.

Studies of the effects of water table and influence of water level fluctuations on vegetation, particularly moose browse species, along the floodplain of the Susitna River should be initiated immediately. A map of areas where changes in flow caused by the dams will alter the vegetation, either through changes in soil moisture or by allowing plant succession to occur, should be prepared. Emphasis should be placed on areas of high moose use such as the lower Susitna River.

Detailed studies of vegetation in important moose wintering areas should be conducted to identify plant species used by moose and quantify their presence, use and trends. Study areas would be identified from data collected under the moose studies.

Schedule:

FY 78	Habitat mapping, effects of water level studies
FY 79	Habitat mapping, effects of water level studies
FY 80	Map areas of expected plant composition changes. vegetation studies on moose winter range
FY 81	Moose winter range studies
FY 82	Moose winter range studies

Title: Impact of the Susitna Hydropower Project on Moose Populations

Objectives: To identify moose subpopulations using habitat subject to direct and indirect impact of the Susitna Hydropower Project.

To determine the seasonal distribution, movement patterns, size and trends of those subpopulations.

To determine the timing and degree of dependency of those subpopulations on habitat to be impacted by the Susitna Hydropower Project.

Background: Several subpopulations of moose occupy habitats that may be inundated or substantially altered by the proposed Susitna Hydropower Project. Limited studies conducted in 1977 identified one subpopulation which occupied the upper ends of tributaries north of the proposed impoundment areas during spring, summer and fall, then migrated to the Susitna River bottomlands during winter. Similar populations almost certainly occupy drainages to the south of the impoundments. There is also strong evidence that riparian habitat along the mainstem, which may be significantly altered by the stabilization of water flow, also serves as winter range for several subpopulations of moose. These habitats may be critical to these populations in severe winters. Other subpopulations may be nonmigratory and use areas to be affected all year. Some migratory populations may not rely on the river bottoms for seasonal range but may migrate through them on their way between seasonal ranges.

The degree of impact will vary depending on the subpopulations size, status and degree of dependence on altered habitat and the nature of the habitat alteration. Many factors must be considered including: the sex and age composition of members of the subpopulation using the habitat (often pregnant cows or cows with calves are more dependent on lowland areas than bulls), the overall range of the subpopulation (some members of a nearby subpopulation migrate up to 60 miles indicating that reductions in moose densities could occur over a vast area), the availability of alternative ranges particularly during severe winters (habitat alterations which may be relatively insignificant in normal or mild winters may be devastating when heavy snowfall makes alternative ranges unavailable), etc.

An adequate assessment of the potential impacts of the Susitna Project on moose requires a thorough understanding of moose populations using the area. This information must then be related to a knowledge of the habitat and the elements within that habitat that are necessary for moose. This study is designed to provide the necessary information on moose. It is essential that certain habitat studies be conducted concurrently. A habitat map of sufficient detail to delineate types selected by moose, covering the impoundment area, surrounding drainages, transmission corridors and the floodplain of the Susitna River to its mouth, should be prepared at an early stage of the studies. Detailed browse studies should be conducted at sites selected on the basis of use by moose to identify important browse species, measure the degree of use and identify other elements of the habitats that are important to moose. The role of

the water table and spring flooding in maintaining moose habitat below Devils Canyon should be determined and maps delineating areas where the alteration of the flow will result in vegetation changes should be prepared.

This moose study and the habitat studies outlined above should be closely coordinated as each will influence the final design of the other and all are necessary to relate habitat changes to moose.

Procedures: During 1977, 12 moose were radio collared and 14 others were collared with visually identifiable collars. These moose were tracked from March to December 1977. Under this study, tracking of those moose will be continued, to further delineate the ranges of that subpopulation.

Additional moose will be radio collared in drainages along the south side of the proposed impoundment area and in riparian habitats along the mainstem below Devils Canyon.

Each radio collared moose will be relocated regularly. For each relocation the exact location, habitat type, activity of the moose and association with other animals will be recorded.

A random stratified census and seasonal sex and age composition counts will be conducted on subpopulations most likely to be affected by the Susitna Hydropower Project. Concentrations of moose will be mapped throughout the area whenever the opportunity arises.

These data will be used to identify subpopulations using areas to be impacted, to determine the seasonal ranges and migration routes of each subpopulation and to estimate the size and composition of those subpopulations most likely to be impacted. Locations of moose will be overlaid on habitat maps to determine the degree of use of certain habitat types as well as specific habitats. This information will be analyzed by subpopulation, season, sex and age class and reproductive status. Areas likely to be altered by the project that are critical to a subpopulation will be identified and recommended for more detailed vegetation studies.

Schedule:

FY 78	Radio collar moose, tracking flights, composition counts
FY 79	Tracking flights, composition counts, random stratified count. Review habitat map and map of downstream areas to be impacted and identify data gaps. Identify areas for detailed vegetation studies.
FY 80	Replace radios and radio collar new moose to fill identified data gaps, tracking flights, composition counts.
FY 81	Tracking flights, composition counts, random stratified counts.
FY 82	Tracking flights, composition count, start final analysis of data.
FY 83	Tracking flights, complete analysis of impact of Susitna Hydropower Project on moose, write final report.

Cost:

FY 78	\$220,000
FY 79	\$210,000
FY 80	\$180,000
FY 81	\$210,000
FY 82	\$175,000
FY 83	\$ 85,000

Title: Mitigation measures for lost moose habitat.

Objectives: To identify and evaluate measures for enhancing moose habitat.

To locate areas where moose habitat enhancement would effectively mitigate loss or deterioration of moose habitat resulting from the Susitna Hydropower Project.

Background: Important and perhaps critical moose habitat will be totally lost or reduced in quality by the Susitna Hydropower Project. The proposed moose and habitat studies should quantify this loss and its resulting impact on moose populations.

Moose tend to favor subclimax ranges. In recent years several agencies have recognized a potential for enhancing habitat for moose by setting back plant succession through artificial means. The Alaska Department of Fish and Game, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and U.S. Forest Service have all experimented with such techniques as mechanical crushing, prescribed burning and fertilizing. At present these techniques have not been fully evaluated.

Such techniques are probably effective only in certain types of habitats. In some cases it might be possible to fully mitigate the impact on a particular subpopulation of moose. For example, if an effective technique can be found to maintain willow habitats on river bars without periodic flooding, impacts on subpopulations dependent on downstream habitat might be kept to a minimum.

In other cases where critical habitat will be completely destroyed it might be possible to make alternative habitat available to the affected subpopulation of moose. However, there will likely be some subpopulations for which mitigation measures will not be possible. In these cases the loss to human users could be offset by enhancing the range of populations of moose away from the Project area.

In order to assess these possibilities it is necessary to evaluate the various techniques and to delineate habitat where these techniques would have a positive effect on moose.

This project is designed to provide information to assess the feasibility of mitigation and to initiate long term studies which would direct actual mitigation efforts. Evaluation of these long term studies will take many years. The need to complete the long term studies will depend on the results of the feasibility study.

Procedures: A complete review of potential moose habitat manipulation techniques will be made. Areas which have been experimentally manipulated in the past will be visited and the quantity and quality of potential moose browse produced will be assessed. Information gaps will be identified and if necessary further experimental manipulation will be recommended.

Data from the habitat mapping, vegetation and moose studies will be used to identify areas where habitat manipulation might offset adverse impacts on each of the subpopulations of moose that are identified.

Schedule:

FY 79	Preliminary review of techniques and identification of areas of past experimentation.
FY 80	Evaluation of success of previous manipulation efforts. Identification of data gaps. Recommendations on future experimentation.
FY 81	Continue evaluation of manipulated areas. Initiate manipulation experiments to fill data gaps.
FY 82	Evaluate techniques. Identify potential areas for mitigation.
FY 83	Evaluate techniques. Identify potential areas for mitigation.

Cost:

FY 79	\$ 5,000
FY 80	\$ 20,000
FY 81	\$275,000 (actual cost will depend on results of FY 79 and 80 studies)
FY 82	\$ 20,000
FY 83	\$ 20,000

Title: Impact of the Susitna Hydropower Project on caribou populations.

Objectives: To identify subpopulations of caribou in the Nelchina Basin.

To determine the seasonal ranges and migration routes of these subpopulations with emphasis on traditional migration routes across proposed impoundment areas and potential alternative routes.

To determine the availability of suitable alternative seasonal ranges to caribou subpopulations that might be isolated from traditional ranges by the proposed impoundments.

Background: The Nelchina basin has been the most important sport hunting area for caribou in Alaska. Although caribou numbers were reduced from a recorded high of 72,000 to a low of 10,000 the population is presently increasing and is now estimated to exceed 14,000 caribou. Proposed management plans state that the population will be allowed to increase until it numbers 20,000 caribou.

Caribou traditionally have used a variety of ranges on both sides of the Susitna River and varying numbers have crossed the Susitna at least twice a year. Major crossing locations have been recorded in areas which would be affected by the proposed hydropower project. Because caribou frequently migrate long distances and may periodically overgraze one range and shift to another, it is necessary to examine the status of caribou and identify alternative ranges over a large area.

Range studies conducted by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game have shown that the most desirable winter ranges remaining in the Nelchina basin are located in the Clearwater Mountains, Chumilna Hills, Susitna Uplands and Monahan Flats. Most of these ranges are north of the Susitna River while historical and recent calving and summer ranges exist south of the river. The preferred lichens south of the river have generally declined and have not shown substantial recovery even with lowered caribou populations. Meanwhile, the Nelchina population has used this area to a greater extent than the other portions of its range. A portion of the winter range exists east of the Richardson Highway in the Wrangell Mountains but movement into this range may be affected by the recent construction of the oil pipeline from Prudhoe Bay to Valdez. All of these factors make it likely that the ability to cross the Susitna will remain critical to the well being of the Nelchina caribou herd.

To determine the extent that the impoundments will affect this movement is difficult. Other migration routes may be used in addition to those already shown in the literature or sufficient range may be available to the east to support the proposed population level. It is also possible that a separate but smaller population exists north of the Susitna which may increase to fill the available range in that area even if the existing Nelchina population were confined to the area south of the proposed impoundments.

Procedures: Caribou on both sides of the Susitna River will be radiocollared during the breeding season. Monitoring flights will be made at a relatively low intensity (approximately monthly) throughout most of the year to determine if more than one population exists in the area and to determine seasonal ranges of each population identified. More intensive monitoring flights will be made during the periods of precalving and postcalving movements and winter shift to determine present migration routes and the timing of migration. It will be necessary to repeat this procedure for several years to determine variation among years.

Traditional migration routes will be determined by mapping trails and will be compared with present routes.

Potential alternative ranges will be identified and evaluated using the modified Hult Surlander method of range analysis. These ranges will be compared with Nelchina ranges that have been studied for a number of years.

Schedule:

FY 79	Radio collar caribou, monitor movements. Conduct range analysis.
FY 80	Replace inoperative radios, monitor movements.
FY 81	Replace inoperative radios, monitor movements.
FY 82	Replace inoperative radios, monitor movements.
FY 83	Monitor movements. Repeat range analysis to determine trends.

Cost:

FY 79	\$120,000
FY 80	\$ 95,000
FY 81	\$ 95,000
FY 82	\$ 95,000
FY 83	\$102,000

Title: Effects of the Susitna Hydropower Project on wolves.

Objectives: To determine the number of wolf packs and the number of wolves in each pack that inhabit areas to be directly affected by the Susitna Hydropower Project.

To determine the proportions of each pack's territory that lies within areas of impact.

To determine the location of dens, rendezvous sites, hunting areas and the other essential activity areas of each pack in relation to proposed impoundments and construction activities.

To determine the dependence of each pack on prey populations that may be adversely affected by the Project.

Background: Wolves are of considerable national concern as evidenced by recent newspaper and magazine articles. They are known to inhabit the entire project area and information on population size and movements is needed to determine project impacts.

Studies in other areas of southcentral Alaska have demonstrated that some wolves have home ranges as large as 2,000 square miles while many packs have territories ranging from 200 to 600 square miles. It is known that the immediate project area may contain five or more wolf packs. It appears that some of these packs use the Susitna River as a territory boundary, and inundation and associated development could have a dramatic influence on them. These packs depend heavily on moose populations that use the impoundment areas. In addition other studies have shown that any human disturbance relatively close to a wolf den may cause abandonment of the traditional site and perhaps reproductive failure.

Procedures: Two to four wolves will be radio collared in each pack whose territory is believed to include potential impoundment areas and construction sites. The numbers of wolves in each pack will be determined, each pack's territory will be delineated and the degree and nature of use of potential impact areas will be determined through repeated relocations and observation of activities. Specifically, all den sites, rendezvous sites and favored hunting areas will be mapped. These data will be used to determine the degree of dependence of wolves on various areas that will be impacted by the Project.

Dependency on various prey species will be determined by scat analysis and observation of hunting behavior and kills. This information will be used in conjunction with data from the accompanying studies of prey species, particularly the moose study, to estimate indirect impacts on wolves caused by a reduction in prey availability.

Field activities and manpower for this study will be integrated with the moose study. Wolves frequently will be tagged and relocated at the same time as moose. Full funding of the moose study is required for the successful implementation of this study.

Schedule:

FY 78	Radiocollar wolves, monitoring flights.
FY 79	Replace lost radios, monitoring flights.
FY 80	Replace lost radios, monitoring flights.
FY 81	Radiocollar new wolves to fill data gaps. Monitoring flights.
FY 82	Monitoring flights.
FY 83	Monitoring flights.

Cost:

FY 78	\$55,000
FY 79	\$36,000
FY 80	\$29,000
FY 81	\$40,000
FY 82	\$25,000
FY 83	\$13,000

Title: Effects of the Susitna Hydropower Project on black and brown/grizzly bears.

Objectives: To estimate the numbers of black and brown/grizzly bears using the area to be impacted by the Susitna Hydropower Project.

To determine the dependency of these bears on areas to be impacted, with emphasis on identification of denning areas and seasonal feeding areas.

Background: Very little is known of either brown or black bear populations in the Susitna Basin except that brown bear densities appear to have been very high for several years. We do not know how many bears inhabit the area or how dependent they are on the impoundment areas. Studies should be conducted to estimate bear numbers in and surrounding project area, determine whether the same bears are resident or whether a larger number have a seasonal dependency on the area, and determine the location and extent of denning activities.

A major problem with any large construction project is the attraction of bears to camps and construction sites. This usually results in threats to human safety, delays in construction and destruction of bears. If areas of bear concentration can be identified and avoided during construction, these problems can be substantially reduced.

Procedures: Bears will be radiocollared in the project area. Movements in and around the area will be monitored. Den sites and concentration areas will be mapped.

Bear numbers will be estimated through marked/unmarked ratios observed during spring and fall composition counts and by recording all bears seen during tracking flights.

Field activities for this study will be closely integrated with those for the moose and wolf studies. Full funding of the moose study is required for the successful implementation of this study.

Schedule:

FY 79	Radiocollar bears, monitoring flights composition counts.
FY 80	Monitoring flights, composition counts.
FY 81	Monitoring flights, composition counts.
FY 82	Monitoring flights.

Cost:

FY 79	\$95,000
FY 80	\$57,000
FY 81	\$50,000
FY 82	\$35,000

Title: Effects of the Susitna Hydropower Project on wolverine.

Objectives: To determine the population status of wolverines using areas to be impacted by the Susitna Hydropower Project.

To determine movement patterns and identify habitats of seasonal importance to wolverines.

Background: Less is known about the wolverine than any other big game species in Alaska. Threatened with extinction throughout most of its range in the Scandinavian countries, parts of Russia, the continental United States and Eastern Canada, it is still considered relatively abundant in Alaska. Studies in Idaho and Sweden indicate that wolverines have exceptionally large home ranges. Records of males moving 15 miles in a 24 hour period are not uncommon.

The Talkeetna mountains on either side of the Susitna River between Gold Creek and the MacLaren River presently support a healthy population of wolverines. Although their density is not known at this time, it is probably as high or higher there than in any other portion of their range in Southcentral Alaska. Because the welfare of this species in Alaska is of both national and international concern, some intensive efforts to determine the status, distribution, and movement patterns of wolverine in the project area are warranted.

Procedures: A limited number of wolverines will be radiocollared and tracked in conjunction with other telemetry studies in the area. Home ranges, movement patterns, and seasonal habitat use will be determined by systematic relocation of radiocollared animals.

A systematic aerial survey of wolverines and their tracks will be made in conjunction with wolf studies to determine the distribution and numbers of wolverines using the area.

These data will be used to estimate the number of wolverines using the impoundment areas, determine the degree of dependency of certain wolverines on those areas and identify specific areas of importance to wolverines.

Schedule:

FY 79	Radiocollar, monitoring flights, census.
FY 80	Radiocollar, monitoring flights, census.
FY 81	Monitoring flights.

Cost:

FY 79	\$30,000
FY 80	\$25,000
FY 81	\$10,000

Title: Distribution and status of Dall sheep adjacent to the Susitna Hydropower Project area.

Objectives: To determine the numbers of Dall sheep inhabiting mountains adjacent to proposed dam sites.

To delineate the seasonal ranges of the sheep population.

Background: A relatively isolated sheep population inhabits mountains adjacent to the proposed dam sites. While there will probably be little direct impact on this population by the proposed project, there is a possibility of adverse impacts from human disturbance as a result of dam construction activities and increased access.

Procedures: Aerial surveys will be conducted to determine the size of the sheep population and to delineate seasonal ranges.

Schedule:

FY 79	Aerial surveys.
FY 80	Aerial surveys.
FY 81	Aerial surveys.

Cost:

FY 79	\$3,000
FY 80	\$3,000
FY 81	\$1,000

Title: Distribution and abundance of furbearers and small game in the proposed Susitna Hydropower Project impoundment areas.

Objectives: To determine the distribution and relative abundance of furbearers and small game in the proposed impoundment areas and determine the degree of use of those species by humans.

To determine the dependence of furbearers and waterfowl on downstream habitats which will be altered by changes in water flow.

Background: Little is known about the distribution and abundance of either furbearers or small game. In order to assess the potential impact of the project on small game it will be necessary to conduct a basic biological reconnaissance. It is known from data collected incidentally to other projects that the Susitna River Basin provides habitat for large numbers of fox, wolverine, and river otter. All three of these species are highly sought by trappers.

Stabilization of water flow could substantially alter aquatic furbearers and waterfowl habitat downstream.

Procedures: Limited aerial surveys will be conducted to determine the presence, distribution and relative abundance of fox, otters, beavers, ptarmigan, waterfowl and raptors. On the ground observations will be made in conjunction with the nongame project.

Trappers and residents of the area will be interviewed.

Surveys of aquatic furbearers and waterfowl will be conducted in downstream areas of probable habitat alteration that will be identified by studies on the effects of water flow on habitat.

Schedule:

FY 79	Surveys in impoundment areas, interviews.
FY 80	Surveys in impoundment areas, interviews.
FY 82	Surveys downstream.
FY 83	Surveys downstream.

Cost:

FY 79	\$35,000
FY 80	\$35,000
FY 82	\$25,000
FY 83	\$25,000

Title: Distribution and abundance of nongame species of wildlife in the area to be impacted by the Susitna Hydropower Project.

Objectives: To determine the occurrence, distribution and relative abundance of small mammals and passerine birds in the proposed impoundment areas.

Background: Little is known about the occurrence, distribution or abundance of small mammals and both resident and migratory passerine birds in the Project impact area. A limited reconnaissance should be conducted.

Procedures: A literature search will be conducted. Surveys from the ground will be made and limited trapping will be done. Portions of this study will be coordinated with small game and furbearer studies.

Schedule:

FY 79	Literature search, initiate surveys.
FY 80	Complete surveys.

Cost:

FY 79	\$7,000
FY 80	\$8,000

PLEASE NOTE: THE FOLLOWING PAGES WERE TREATED
AS A UNIT IN THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENT.

STATE OF ALASKA

JAY S. HAMMOND, GOVERNOR

DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER

SUBPORT BUILDING
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99801

March 15, 1979


The Honorable Brian Rogers
Alaska State Legislature
Pouch V, State Capitol
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Dear Mr. Rogers:

Subject: Susitna Hydroelectric Project

Previously, the Department of Fish and Game transmitted information on the Susitna Hydroelectric Project to your office at the request of Mr. Mark Wittow. Enclosed is a copy of the "Preliminary Environmental Assessment of Hydroelectric Development on the Susitna River" prepared by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. I hope you find this additional information on the Susitna Hydroelectric Project useful.

Sincerely,



Ronald O. Skoog
Commissioner

Enclosure

2

**PRELIMINARY ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
OF HYDROELECTRIC DEVELOPMENT
ON THE SUSITNA RIVER**

**Prepared for the
United States Fish and Wildlife Service**

**by the
Alaska Department of Fish and Game
333 Raspberry Road
Anchorage, Alaska**

1978

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Section I Fisheries and Habitat Investigations of the Susitna River	
Summary	I-7
Background	I-9
Description of Area	I-10
Procedures	I-11
Findings and Discussion	I-17
Conclusion	I-47
Recommendations	I-48
Acknowledgements	I-50
Literature Cited	I-51
Section II Moose Movements and Habitat Use Along the Upper Susitna River	
Summary	II-3
Background	II-4
Description of Area	II-7
Procedures	II-8
Findings	II-11
Discussion	II-26
Conclusion	II-31
Recommendations	II-34
Acknowledgements	II-34
Literature Cited	II-36

Fisheries and Habitat Investigations
of the Susitna River--A Preliminary Study of
Potential Impacts of the Devils
Canyon and Watana Hydroelectric Projects

by
James C. Riis
and
Nancy V. Friese

Alaska Department of Fish and Game
Divisions of Sport and Commercial Fish

March 1978

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
List of Figures	4
List of Tables	5
List of Appendix Tables	6
Summary	7
Background	9
Description of Area	10
Procedures	11
Fisheries	13
Adults	13
Juvenile salmon migration	13
Juvenile studies	14
Water Quantity	16
Water Quality	17
Findings and Discussion	17
Fisheries	17
Adults	17
Juvenile salmon migration	23
Juvenile studies	28
Aquatic insects and juvenile salmon gut contents	30
Impoundment area fisheries investigations	37
Water Quantity	40
Water Quality	43
Conclusion	47
Recommendations	48
Acknowledgements	50
Literature Cited	51

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)

	<u>Page</u>
Appendix I	53
Appendix II	73
Appendix III	96

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	The Susitna River drainage, Devils Canyon Project, 1977 . . .	12
2	Upper Susitna River study area, Devils Canyon Project, 1977 .	15
3	Locations of adult salmon tag recoveries occurring downstream of the Susitna River fishwheel sites, Devils Canyon Project, 1977 (RS-sockeye salmon; PS-pink salmon; CS-chum salmon; SS-coho salmon; KS-chinook salmon)	22
4	Susitna River discharge at Gold Creek, Devils Canyon Project, 1977	41

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Relative magnitude of pink, chum, and sockeye salmon moving past the fishwheel sites as determined by Peterson population estimates, Devils Canyon Project, 1974, 1975, and 1977. ^{1/} . . .	18
2	Peak chum, pink, and sockeye salmon ground escapement survey counts within the upper Susitna River, Devils Canyon Project, 1977	20
3	Peak chinook salmon counts within the Susitna River drainage, 1977	21
4	Rabideux Creek salmon fry trapping, Devils Canyon Project, 1977	24
5	Montana Creek salmon fry trapping, Devils Canyon Project, 1977	26
6	Willow Creek chinook salmon fry trapping, Devils Canyon Project, 1977	27
7	Mean percent composition of gut contents per fish of chinook, sockeye, and coho salmon juveniles in sloughs and clearwater tributaries of the Susitna River, Devils Canyon Project, 1977.	32
8	Limnological data from selected tributaries to the Susitna River, Devils Canyon Project, 1977	38
9	Susitna River impoundment area lake surveys, Devils Canyon Project, 1977	39
10	Water flows of Montana, Rabideux, and Willow creeks from May through November, Devils Canyon Project, 1977. ^{1/}	44
11	Thermograph set in Susitna River downstream of Parks Highway bridge, daily maximum and minimum water temperature, Devils Canyon Project, 1978	45

LIST OF APPENDIX TABLES

Appendix I

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Percent age composition of chinook, sockeye, coho, and chum salmon escapement samples, Devils Canyon Project, 1974, 1975, and 1977	54
2	Age, length, and sex characteristics of chum, chinook, sockeye, and coho salmon escapement samples, Devils Canyon Project, 1974, 1975, and 1977	55
3	Analyses of age, length, weight, and condition factors of juvenile sockeye salmon samples from Susitna River sloughs and clearwater tributaries, Devils Canyon Project, 1977 . . .	56-57
4	Analyses of age, length, weight, and condition factors of juvenile coho salmon samples from Susitna River sloughs and clearwater tributaries, Devils Canyon Project, 1977	58-59
5	Analyses of age, length, weight, and condition factors of juvenile chinook salmon samples from Susitna River sloughs and clearwater tributaries, Devils Canyon Project, 1977 . . .	60-64
6	Stomach content analysis of juvenile chinook, coho, and sockeye salmon collected in sloughs and clearwater tributaries of the Susitna River during summer and fall, Devils Canyon Project, 1977	65-72

Appendix II

1	Susitna River discharge at Gold Creek (USGS provisional data) 1977	74
2	Water quality data and juvenile salmon surveys in sloughs and clearwater tributaries of the Susitna River between the Chulitna River and Portage Creek, Devils Canyon Project, 1977.	75-81
3	Thermograph set in Rabideux Creek, upper sub-area; daily maximum and minimum water temperature, Devils Canyon Project, 1977	82
4	Thermograph set in Montana Creek, upper sub-area; daily maximum and minimum water temperature, Devils Canyon Project, 1977	83
5	Water chemistry data, Rabideux Creek, Devils Canyon Project, 1977	84
6	Water chemistry data, Montana Creek, Devils Canyon Project, 1977	85
7	United States Department of Interior, Geological Survey . . .	86-95

SUMMARY

Biological and water quality and quantity investigations were conducted from May 1, 1977 through March 7, 1978 to obtain baseline data on indigenous fish populations and the existing aquatic habitat of the Susitna River drainage. These investigations conclude a four year series of environmental baseline inventories. They were designed to generate sufficient biological information to enable the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) to prepare a comprehensive biological study plan in the event a final environmental impact study is initiated to determine the feasibility of constructing the proposed Watana and Devils Canyon hydroelectric dams on the Susitna River.

The relative abundance, distribution and migrational timing of adult salmon (Oncorhynchus sp.) were determined within the Susitna River drainage through tag and recovery programs during 1977. The salmon escapement from June 29 through August 14 was estimated to be approximately 237,000 sockeye (O. nerka), 50,000 coho (O. kisutch), and 105,000 chum salmon (O. keta) (Friese, in prep.). An escapement estimate in excess of 100,000 fish was determined for chinook salmon (O. tshawytscha) through aerial surveys (Kubik, 1977; Watsjold, 1977). Population estimates of pink salmon utilizing the drainage in the area of the Susitna and Chulitna river confluence were determined as a part of this study.

Documentation of the outmigration of salmon fry from tributary rearing areas into the mainstem Susitna River was accomplished by intensive investigation of two clearwater tributaries. The objective of these studies was to determine utilization of the mainstem river for rearing during winter months. A total of 25,176 chinook salmon fry were marked

in Montana Creek between July 19 and August 4. A gradual downstream movement of fry was noted from the latter part of August to February. A drastic reduction in population density was found in February and was attributed to low flows which prevailed at the time. Chinook fry were documented overwintering in the Susitna River. No distinct movement of fry was observed in Rabideux Creek.

The relative abundance, distribution, age, length, and weight characteristics, and feeding habits of juvenile salmonids were monitored in sloughs and tributaries of the Susitna River from Portage Creek downstream to the Chulitna River confluence from July 1 through October 5, 1977. The predominant rearing species were chinook and coho salmon. Water quality and quantity determinations were made in conjunction with all juvenile salmon surveys.

The Susitna River was floated from its intersection with the Denali Highway to Devils Canyon during the first two weeks of July to inventory fish species present and survey the aquatic habitat in the areas to be inundated. Arctic grayling (Thymallus arcticus) were abundant in all of the clearwater tributaries within the proposed impoundment area. The headwaters of these tributaries and upland lakes were also surveyed by separate crews. It is apparent that the Watana reservoir, which is projected to have substantial seasonal fluctuations, will alter the fisheries habitat.

Measurements of hydrological and limnological parameters associated with the Susitna River and selected tributaries and sloughs were obtained between the Denali Highway and Montana Creek. A cooperative agreement between the United States Geological Survey (USGS) and the ADF&G was initiated to determine discharge, sediment loads, and standard water