



Public Infrastructure (PI) Technical Working Group (TWG)
Catalog of Adaptation Options
Process and Criteria for “Balloting” (Voting) to Identify Highest Priority Options

1.0 PROCESS FOR USE OF CRITERIA AND “BALLOTING” (VOTING)

The goal of balloting is to identify 6-10 priority options from the catalog that the PI TWG will develop more fully and then recommend to the AAG and subcabinet for State action.

The way most TWG groups are choosing to use the criteria (next page) is:

1. Each TWG member individually considers all six criteria *collectively*, then either assigns ONE weight – high, medium or low - to all options in the catalog, OR simply identify the 6-10 options that you feel merits a high ranking based on the six criteria. Either way, for those you rank as high, you should jot down a note about which of the six criteria most influenced your decision-making for that option and why.
2. We will then tally each member’s votes for “high” to develop our 1st round, collective PI TWG list of high priority options.
3. Next, we will discuss the list of options ranked high together and the rationale members used for nominating their selections.
4. After that, we will conduct a 2nd round of balloting (and more as needed) to reduce the list further until we have a total of highest ranked 6-10 options.

For each of the 6-10 options, we will develop a more detailed explanation of the option, parties, costs etc. during November-January. We will forward this package to the AAG and subcabinet for State action. We will discuss this more when we are together on October 27

2.0 POTENTIAL CRITERIA FOR RATING OPTIONS

1. Significance

Considers the importance of the option to the functioning of state and community infrastructure. How critical is it to the overall viability of the Alaska's public infrastructure that this option be implemented? How important is it to other intangible issues such as public health safety and welfare, social justice, the viability of small or rural communities, historical ways of life, etc.?

2. Benefits and effectiveness

Compares the vulnerability of not implementing the option to vulnerability if the option is implemented. This difference in vulnerability can be thought of as the primary benefit of the adaptation option. Ancillary or co-benefits should be considered if the potential state action provides benefits to sectors other than public infrastructure. This criterion also evaluates whether a policy provides benefits in only the short-term or over the longer term as well. This criterion also includes the concept of flexibility: will the proposed state action be adjusted in response to changing conditions or will it be effective under different plausible climate scenarios? (e.g., no regrets if the option is implemented and changes don't occur or occur differently than anticipated.)

3. Costs

Addresses whether an option is relatively expensive or inexpensive. Cost includes the initial costs of implementing a potential state action. However, costs over time, such as operation and maintenance, administration and staffing, expected frequency of reconstruction can also be considered, as should non-economic and non-quantifiable costs, such as the "cost" of resource value lost if action is not taken. For example, costs such as an increased impact on human health should be considered along with more traditional costs.

4. Feasibility

Addresses whether the state can realistically implement the proposed action. Is it within state authority or is it more appropriately the role of the federal government, local government, businesses, etc? Do the necessary legal, administrative, financial, technical, and other resources exist, and are they available for use on this proposed state action? Will the action take a great deal of time to be implemented, or can it be quickly implemented?

5. Timing of Impact

Assesses whether the action is needed in response to likely immediate impacts (e.g., thawing ice and permafrost) vs longer term impacts. Options that respond to impacts already occurring or projected to occur in the near future may merit greater consideration than those that address longer-term impacts.

6. Adaptive Capacity

Addresses the ability of a human or natural system to cope with the consequences of climate change. Some systems can accommodate changes in climate without significant intervention while other systems cannot. For example, most hard infrastructure, such as roads, bridges, coastal buildings, etc. cannot alter their alignment, elevation, or structural foundation to accommodate coastal erosion or increased flood risk. Consequently, adaptive capacity may be lower for hard infrastructure than for agriculture, which can move to a more suitable location.