Immediate Action Workgroup – Meeting Summary
(including post-meeting updates)
February 17, 2011; 1 – 4:30 pm
Anchorage – ADEC Main Conference Room

Agency Participants: Trish Opheen and Carl Borash, USACE; John Madden, DHS&EM; Mike Coffey, ADOT; Luke Hopkins, AML; Amy Holman, NOAA; Mike Black, ANTHC; Bob Pawlowski, AK Legislature; Sally Cox, DCCECD/DCRA; Kolena Momberger-Byers, ADEC; Nicole Kinsman, ADNR; Jamilia George, Denali Commission

Community Participants: Howard Weyiouanna, Sr., Shishmaref; Stanley Tom, Newtok Tribal Council; Ernest Weiss, Nelson Lagoon

Facilitator: Margaret King, MJKING & Associates

DRAFT

Outcomes and Next Steps

- The IAWG is greatly energized to refine a new approach, which was identified at the 2/17/11 meeting, and to brief Commissioner Hartig on its merits and costs at its next meeting: March 3, 2011 from 1 – 4:30 pm at ADEC Main Conference Room.

- Immediately: J Madden will send an email to Commissioner Hartig, updating him that the FY 12 funding request that is needed is $600k for ACCIMP, and requesting him to participate in 3/3/11 meeting.

- Conduct virtual meetings /smaller workgroups in the next two weeks:
  - Integrate ACCIMP/DHS&EM with IAWG (See A. on Page 3; J. Madden / S. Cox)
  - Identify other/new studies to inform the process/identify and set priorities (See B. on page 4; J. Madden / M. Black)

- Update Funding Status and Recommendation Document (M. King; A. Holman will submit language to capture NOAA activities (all communities).

- USACE will work with Denali Commission to develop a draft letter that would be helpful to have the Governor send to USACE (T. Opheen and J. George)

- IAWG Policy Recommendations on hold until 3/3/11 meeting or after.

Agenda and Document Review

The facilitator reviewed the agenda and the documents that the IAWG would converse about and make changes to.

The draft documents brought forward were:

1) Draft 2 Status and FY12-13 Budget Recommendation
The facilitator made the following reflections about the document, in particular for the FY12-13 Column:
- Few entries had a recommended $ amount for funding
- In a number of cases the text didn't tie well to current or past actions
- The entries may be an attempt at a placeholder for FY 13, but if IAWG isn't authorized (or re-authorized), is it something IAWG should do?

2) New Community or Project Process Options
A process was identified and details are described in **New Community or Project Process Selected Option** on pages 2- 5 of this summary.

3) Options for Criteria to Select New Projects or Communities
--- New Community Criteria Worksheet
--- New Project Criteria Worksheet
--- USACE Criteria from 2009 IAWG Recommendations Report
The group quickly reviewed these criteria and identified that the first two would require a great deal of work. The USACE Criteria had been used by DCCED/DCRA is selecting additional communities beyond the original six, and believed that the criteria worked for either communities or projects. Based on the proposed new process to integrate ACCIMP/EM and IAWG to select new projects/communities, the criteria identified here isn't needed for the IAWG.

4) Policies and Procedures Recommendations (On hold until 3/3/ or later)
-- New Recommendations
-- 2009 IAWG Summary of Policy Recommendations
-- 2009 IAWG Full Text of Policy Recommendations

Proposed Process to Select New Communities or Projects for Immediate Action

The group took up the Process Options document first.

The purpose of identifying and using a process is to provide the State with the ability to make informed decisions about additional projects or communities where immediate action is needed to prevent loss of life or infrastructure.

M. Black, based on his previous position as the DCCED Deputy Commissioner, brought forward what the overview and IAWG role for selecting communities was originally identified as:

- ➔ The IAWG would be the body to review data and information available and make decisions about which projects and or communities needed immediate action, and to recommend the actions to take.

Other premises the group agreed to were:

DRAFT

- ➔ The IAWG does not need to know *everything* before it recommends *some thing* be done to prevent loss of life/infrastructure.

- ➔ The IAWG will identify and use other information resources produced by other governmental, non-governmental, and academic organizations.

- ➔ The IAWG's intent is to focus on identifying projects and priorities for the Sub-cabinet's consideration to align with timelines to be included in the Governor's budget. These projects/priorities will be recommended for budgeting/funding and managed within existing departments and programs.

The group talked about these premises as the basis for a process, and began sharing ideas about how it should work with other efforts and resources.

NOTE: The following Concepts were identified at the 2/17/11 meeting. The intent was to have additional discussions to detail these concepts between 2/17 and 3/3/11 meeting. As of 3/1, due to travel and other time pressures, no discussions had been held.

A. Integrate ACCIMP and IAWG -- The general understanding about how IAWG could select new communities/projects was:

1) Modify the ACCIMP grant process to allow several additional steps that include review / changes /approval by IAWG of additional communities /projects. This modification will improve IAWG's ability to gather additional information, identify and review documentation of community needs, review data and information to analyze affects to the built environment, and identify and prioritize potential projects to prevent or minimize the affects.

(For 3/3/11 meeting: Develop / revise ACCIMP's flowchart graphic as a visual to understand the process, then detail in a descriptive write-up.)

2) Revise regulations to match the desired new process, and allow for the necessary level of funding to spend on Hazard Assessments and Community Planning to address the needs of a community.
This is needed to more effectively utilize both DHS&EM's and ACCIMP's efforts and because the legislation/regulations currently mandates the amount to be spent for each plan, which doesn't provide the ability to do what's needed, which sometimes is less and sometimes more.

Post 2/17/11 meeting: EM and ACCIMP met to identify how they can work together and be more effective for the communities they're working in regarding hazardous impact assessments and hazardous planning.

DRAFT

For 3/3/11 meeting: It'd be helpful if EM and ACCIMP developed a matrix to clarify what DHS&EM and ACCIMP's hazard assessments do and what the purpose of each are; designate by checking the box. The purpose of this is see if the best features of the local hazards mitigation plan process used by DHS&EM and hazard impact assessments through the ACCIMP program can be integrated.

Contrast / Compare EM & ACCIMP Hazard Assessments		
Purpose of EM HA:		
Purpose of ACCIMP HA:		
Activity/Task/ Data	**EM Hazard Assessment**	**ACCIMP Hazard Assessment**

B. Utilize other/new studies to inform the process/identification and priority setting

Other informational resources likely include reports, assessments, studies, and the like. Added to the hazard assessments and community plans, the intent is for the collection to quickly yield information on needs, effects, process, and schedules that will result in supportable recommendations to you and the Sub-cabinet.
This includes:

- ACCIMP, which is the only legislatively authorized climate change program for the State,
- DHS&EM's local hazards mitigation plan process, and emergency planning
- Numerous reports/data, such as:
  - ANTHC's Health Impacts and infrastructure data
  - DOT's infrastructure data
  - USACE's various erosion studies and construction projects/capabilities
  - DGGS' mapping
  - DNR's wildfire planning and data

C. IAWG new community / project selection process needs to align with state budget development timeframe and deadlines. IAWG effort also needs to fill the role of a clearinghouse.

The following is a draft process, based on 2/17 conversations, recognizing it is a starting point from which to refine IAWG's thinking.

DRAFT

? Date (Quarter or Month in Calendar Year):

- ACCIMP request input from IAWG members for candidates, and works with IAWG to identify who should submit application on behalf of or in conjunction with candidate.
- ACCIMP conducts grant application process; IAWG members follow up on their identified candidates.
- Collect / document information on communities to develop an analytical tool, includes rating system to help score communities and characteristics of who develops, reviews and scores. (see communities identified by agencies in Appendix A of 2009 IAWG Recommendations Report)

? Date (Quarter or Month in Calendar Year):

- 1-3 IAWG members conduct on the ground site visits.
- Convene (Public or Executive?) Session of the IAWG to review ACCIMP findings and bring additional resources to refine ACCIMP findings, including reports and studies from others to assess level of threats, rank, compare and analyze infrastructure and community conditions, and make decisions on projects that require immediate action to prevent loss of life or infrastructure.

Month?/Early Fall: Identify funding recommendations to Sub-Cabinet and / or IAWG members to take to their agencies for consideration in Governor's Budget for upcoming fiscal year.

Date? Communities (both tribes and cities when both present) need to verify with resolution(s) they want assistance.

Date? : Additions???

Clarifications needed before or at 3/3/11 meeting

- Should the new community / project process be competitive or non competitive?

- The new community/project identification approach will be more open to communities, involving far more communities at a much lower cost.

- The same cost we will produce plans for 50 communities, in a much shorter time with more usable products. We will follow the premise that we do not to know *everything* before we recommend *anything*.

- DHS&EM & ACCIMP Matrix described above will help to clarify how to integrate the best features of the local hazards mitigation plan process used within my division.

- Clarify grants, contracts and capabilities needed to develop assessment products that are useful and useable by DHS&EM, ACCIMP, IAWG and Communities. (NOTE: DHS&EM produces these plans under contracts – not grants – with significant community participation at a cost of about $8k to $10k for each plan. For communities with a recent mitigation plan, the cost could be half that of starting from scratch.)

DRAFT