

Climate Change Immediate Action Workgroup Meeting
January 18, 2008 Anchorage, AK
Convened: 10:00 am

Communities and Individuals Participating by Phone:

Fairbanks: Rod Combellick (DNR)
Donna Gardino (ADOT/PF)
Kivalina: Janet Mitchell, City of Kivalina
Nome: Jeanette Pomrenke, Kawerak Transportation
Newtok: Stanley Tom
Dave Albert
Shishmaref: Tony Weyionanna Sr. and others
Unalakleet
Shaktoolik: Steve Ivanoff

Anchorage In-Person:

IAW Members

Mike Black, Co-Chair (DCCED)
Luke Hopkins (AML)
Bob Pawlowski (AFDF– Legislative Climate Change Representative)
John Madden (MVA)
Krag Johnsen (Denali Commission)

Public and Agency Participants

Neil Rodriguez - Coastal Villages Region Fund
Bruce Sexauer– US Army Corps of Engineers
Tara Jollie – DCCED/DCRA
Sally Russell-Cox – DCCED
Taunnie Boothby – DCCED/DCRA
Mark Roberts - Military & Veterans Affairs
Bob Stewart - Military & Veterans Affairs
Jamilia George – DCCED/Denali Commission
Berney Richert – U.S. Economic Development Administration
Allison Butler – UAF – PhD Candidate
Kolena Momberger - DEC
Margaret (Meg) King – Facilitator (UAA)

➤ Denotes areas for possible policy recommendations

Next Steps from January 18, 2008 Meeting

- 1) After the meeting closed, M. Black suggested that he, Trish Opheen, T. Chapple, Sally Cox and M. King meet to review and if necessary revise the IAW meeting schedule and agenda items. (Target – week of January 21st) **(M. King Coordinates – Tuesday 1/22)**
- 2) Identify/describe why additional funds from the state for Planning is needed – how will these funds enhance planning in threatened communities given that DMVA and the Corps already have planning funds? **(M. Black and J. Madden – no date was explicit, but DCCED has a target date of 1/22 to provide supplemental funding request to OMB)**

- 3) Provide Commissioner Hartig with DCCED's agency-wide survey about implications for agency workload and resource requirements to address climate change. Recommend Commissioner Hartig provide to Sub-Cabinet (all cabinet?) members, as well as to Rep. R. Samuels, chair of the Legislature's Climate Change Committee. **(M. Black with IAW Recommendations – 3/20)**
- 4) Develop a comparison of federal/state disaster programs/requirements/limitations to assist IAW to consider recommendations to Sub-Cabinet on policies. **(J. Madden – by January 28 to provide to IAW prior to the 1/31 meeting)**
- 5) Develop range of possible climate change impacts – to begin defining what those items are that state government should consider as impacts due to climate change **(J. Madden – by January 28 to provide to IAW prior to the 1/31 meeting and Luke Hopkins by January 25 will provide information/guidance ICLEI has created.)**
- 6) Templates for meeting community needs - to provide a blueprint along with information about what resources are needed and available as well as to integrate mechanisms in planning process to make sure resources are not lost/forgone
 - a. Agency funding and timing for Newtok **(S. Cox – by January 28)**
 - b. Allakaket relocation report/case study (J. Madden – as soon as can locate)
 - c. Work with S. Ivanoff (Unalakleet) to create recipe for meeting immediate **action (S. Cox and M. King – by January 28)**
- 7) Schedule meeting room for 2/12 afternoon meeting to review community immediate actions with community members while in town for Forum on the Environment. **(K. Momberger by 1/25)**
- 8) Work with communities to revise and provide IAW members with community matrices **(S. Cox and M. King – all completed by Wednesday, January 30)**

Meeting Summary

Self-introductions were made. The facilitator reviewed the purpose, charge and timeline of the Immediate Action Workgroup (IAW), as well as the agenda.

Identifying Agency Service Impacts to Respond to Climate Change Needs

Co-Chair Mike Black requested that Tara Jollie, Director of the Division of Community & Regional Affairs at the Dept. of Commerce and Community Economic Development provide information about DCCED's agency-wide survey to baseline agency workload impacts due to climate change activities. The survey is being conducted using the electronic Monkey Survey tool. It's anticipated to provide initial information about the impacts – both positive and negative – as well as a first take at costs for DCCED to effectively respond to climate change effects.

Proposed Actions: It was recommended that this process and resulting information be provided to the Chair of the Climate Change Sub-Cabinet, Commissioner Hartig, and the Legislative Commission Representative, B. Pawlowski also suggested it be provided to the Chair of the Legislative Commission, Rep. R. Samuels.

OMB Supplemental Funding Request

M. Black reported that he has been requested to provide OMB with any supplemental request by Tuesday, January 22, 2008. This funding request needs to fit within the parameters:

- issues the funding will address are from climate change

- demonstrate the threats are real/imminent
- how planning will address these threats

He went on to say that funds can be used both at the department (DCCED) and at the local level.

Proposed Action: Provide Mike with your input before Tuesday.

Determine Funding for Climate Change Impacts

This spurred a discussion about what should be funded under “climate change impacts”. It was noted that a lack of sea ice has a general consensus as a cause of erosion, but beyond that there needs to be some deliberation to what should be funded. Funds should not be for whatever anyone wants it to be. IAW Members present indicated agreement on this point.

Proposed Action: J. Madden will provide a first draft of what should be considered for funding under climate change impacts.

Hazardous Mitigation Planning Programs

Mark Roberts – Military & Veterans Affairs, Emergency Management (M&VA- EM) – provided an overview of the hazardous mitigation planning programs and efforts, stating that hazardous mitigation planning was underway in all the communities the IAW is focused on (Newtok, Shishmaref, Kivalina, Unalakleet, Shaktoolik and Koyukuk).

M. Roberts described the mitigation programs to be very limiting for what the funds can be used for. These programs are not for relocating entire communities, but rather for immediate and smaller projects.

Through discussions it was identified Alaska’s program was even more limiting than the federal programs.

See - Alaska Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Management – Mitigation: Immediate Actions for Climate Change (Stafford Act Grant Funding)

Communities have to be identified (pre-disaster), which M&VA-EM is proactive about and assists communities to think ahead and submit the required paperwork as a community at risk – before any disaster happens. Then they work to develop a mitigation plan to deal with/address the needs. This is a 2-Phased process – 1st to identify and 2nd to determine (in a plan) what to do. This is a 2-3 year effort.

25% local match is required for federal grants. Communities, local government (including state, borough, cities and/or tribes can provide the match. The State has said they will absorb the 25% and budgets for this.

Mark recommended to look at efforts already done and to be aware of the specific requirements FEMA has. The projects are a general identification of hazards and threats.

John M. added that one of the programs is very prohibitive and there is a need for State funds that are more inclusive. Another IAW member asked if the State could allocate more funds – “yes”

Pre-disaster national program is a different funding stream awarded on an annual and national competitive basis. There is also the match requirement of 25% from local sources. Here too John M. noted that the concept is good—but too restrictive.

There are also other services, such as community education provided.

B. Pawlowski requested that a definition of *mitigation* be included in any update

Are there hazard mitigation plans already in place for these communities – the group referred to the spreadsheet handed out on 1/8/08.

Newtok, Shishmaref, Unalakleet and Koyukuk all have Hazardous Plans in some stage of development, none of them have a Flood Management Plan. Kivalina has both a Flood Plan and Hazardous Plan in place; Shaktoolik does not – nor has work on either type of plan started.

L. Hopkins asked if there are benefits or penalties for requesting federal funds if requests are tied to climate change. John M. commented that this is where he is recommending policy changes and testified to this that situations that are imminent and tangible should be priorities. But at this time this is not so. No policy changes were made in conjunction with Hurricane Katrina either.

John M. reflected that there is considerable overlap in the IAW and the Sub-Cabinet's Disaster Committee.

Federal/Corps Programs and Projects. Bruce S. commented that the Corps' projects often have restrictions and in recent years have had congressional assistance to help with problems.

- John M. suggested that considering changes in policy to the Stafford Act is needed. In particular in Alaska as the Benefit-Cost analysis is necessary, but the consequence of loss or not providing preventative assistance is not part of the calculations, which is where a B-C analysis would show benefits. But the cost in Alaska of the benefit after a disaster is huge and will overwhelm the benefit. Therefore, Alaska needs more latitude to address the threats – before it's a disaster.

Flood Mitigation Assistance (FMA) Planning Grant and Project Grant:

Taunnie B. provided information on developing these plans. A community must have an approved plan under Flood Mitigation Assistance Program requirements before being eligible to apply for project funding. This is the same as the Hazardous Mitigation Grant Program and Pre-Disaster Grant Program. Where communities are in development of All-Hazard Plans and participate in the National Flood Insurance Program, we (Dept. of Commerce, Community & Economic Development and Dept. of Homeland Security – Emergency Management Division) work closely together to ensure communities develop their plans to meet both criteria and therefore qualify for all the grant opportunities. There are other requirements such as communities must be an incorporated local government to participate in the National Flood Insurance Program, and other restrictions apply too. In addition, there's also a 25% local match required and the current grant proposals must be in by this week.

It was brought forward that other states fund more than the 25% for hazardous mitigation (and prevention), but all are focused. For example in California for earthquakes, in the Midwest for fire, and Washington State also has a program.

- Alaska should develop a program to help unincorporated communities.

Alaska Declared Disasters: 1978-2007

Bob Stewart (DMVA/DHS&EM) provided a summary handout and reviewed the number and type of disaster and type of disaster assistance for facilities, communities and individuals. As a companion to the disaster handout, Bob also included a chart on Responses to Climate-Related Events that were not declared State or Federal Disasters but were events that required significant Division response and

coordination. Bob pointed out that since 2004 these “Non-Disasters” climate related events escalated to 30 events during calendar year 2007 and appear to be inversely proportional to numbers of declared disasters.

- ✓ Bob also identified some current information gaps in the summary handout, such as it did not include the costs of other emergency programs supported by a Governor’s Declaration – 6 declarations supporting federal fire suppression aid to DNR, and 5 declarations supporting Federal Highway Administration Emergency Relief to DOTPF. It also did not include trends by category and numbers of projects. Bob said that he would research, revise and include these items. He was also asked to define mitigation as it is used for these programs/funding.

John M. reflected that there is no common year; there wasn’t one major disaster that qualified as a federal disaster in 2007, but Alaska has many imminent threats on a smaller scale.

Disasters and commensurate funding are normally event driven. Typically, disaster funds are only available after an event and can only be used restore infrastructure to what was there before the disaster. Project completion usually ranges from 3-5 years, but some go beyond 5 years.

John M. said that this process may not assist communities much as far as prevention or relocation. Some of the communities are under 3 different years for federal disaster projects due to the repetitive nature of the disasters. Newtok, for example, has open projects for boardwalk repair and small dock repair.

John M. also commented that the State of Alaska (DHS&EM) is one of the states that acts as an Advisor/Advocate for the communities instead of letting FEMA do what it thinks should be done – when FEMA likely doesn’t understand these communities needs.

In some instances projects can improve facilities and in some cases may be able to rebuild in alternate location. This would be true for federally declared disasters. Under State declared disasters, improved projects are appropriate, but alternate projects are not currently part of our State program. Bob was asked to provide a written handout on improved and alternate projects both under Federal and State programs.

As an example the group examined the Newtok-barge landing which had been taken out by flooding and is now a hardship for the community – there’s no place to off load goods and fuel into the community. Now must fly everything. At the current site there isn’t anywhere the community can rebuild, but an alternate relocation site has been identified. *Is there way to divert funds?*

Bob S. responded that - Only if directly related to life or safety. Like loss of potable water supply... not an economic issue.

What about saltwater intrusion into water system? Bob S- if related to a disaster event then can relocate, but must be directly related to the event, not something that has happened over time. In federal disasters, relocation is usually negotiated with FEMA.

Do communities have to report to receive disaster funds?

Bob S: Communities need to apply for assistance within 30 days from a Declaration. Then, communities must report their damages within 60 days of the first substantive meeting with DHS&EM (& FEMA). DHS&EM can provide technical assistance to help a community with the assessments and applying for assistance.

Bob S. Some Federal policy changes may be coming that will affect mitigation projects and infrastructure repair assistance.

John M. related that current federal mitigation funding is insufficient, especially given the restrictions. From an individual assistance standpoint, Alaska is one of only 5 states that provide funding to help off-set individual disaster damages.

Proposed Action: Develop comparison between federal and state programs, requirements and restrictions to help identify gaps – leading to possible areas for policy changes. (John M.)

USACE Overview of Alaskan Communities Affected by Erosion

Corps Report and Handout:

- Alaska Village Erosion Technical Assistance Program
 - Alaska Baseline Erosion Assessment – Alaskan Communities Affected by Erosion 16 October 2007
- Provides erosion-damage assessment, but there's little funding to address damages.

Shishmaref had so much damage, that something had to be done to the shoreline before all was lost.

Number of Communities and Prioritizing

There is erosion throughout all Alaska. The GAO report identifies 9 priority communities, but the Corps has identified 181 communities in Alaska with erosion problems.

Working with contractor (Christy Miller from TetraTech) the Corps is using a questionnaire to more accurately identify potential for near-term disaster due to erosion and to then prioritize based on better characteristics than currently have. This will allow a more pro-active strategy to address erosion problems.

Erosion Project Funding '08 and New Opportunity

Carl Borash with the Corps stated that most of the current funding - Summer '08 (~ \$5 million) will be going to Kivalina. Primarily because of the dire need at Kivalina and the ability to award a contract both exist for projects at Kivalina.

The Corps has received a congressional request for information about where it might be able to move projects up for funding. This is based on the possible supplemental for addressing the anticipated economic downturn. As much as \$40 mm for erosion.

Tribal Partnership Program

Tribal Partnership Program is another areas where planning is being done with 10 communities and collaborating agencies – not construction. Point Hope, Barrow, Koyukuk are already using these funds to assist with planning and going through the planning process. This is a 75/25 cost share too.

Investigations study/protection plans. Section 117 monies require 50% cost share, but there is a provision to waive, which the Corps is requesting for locations like Yakutat and McGrath this allows for 100% of funding from federal funds rather than cost share for planning and implementation. Barrow is also being considered.

Discussion

If state receives planning funds, how can it interface with the Corps/cost share?

Carl - Helpful if the state has the funds for communities to fully participate and advocate for the communities to assist whether geologic studies, transportation, etc.

If there was funding for coordinator/planner and development of plans, how would this be best applied?

Carl - Funds could also go to a consultant. Most of the Corps' funds have gone directly to in-house staff. Some funds have been applied to geo-tech, drilling and planning. There's a need to coordinate with different agencies and determine specific details of a community's plan. Need to have these plans in a layout.

Do you have any matrix on how the funding are coming together (leveraged)?

Carl – No, but do have one for the Corps. If it is a cost-share program, then the Corps would have a better record of who funded what and at what level.

Sally (Cox) – Offered from the Newtok experience that there are so many unknowns that it's been very difficult to track information and to project and plan for what's needed with the relocation effort. Funding sources are iffy and difficult to get a handle on who is going to fund and what the requirements of the project is and what agencies' requirements are.

Everyone has a different tracking system and so the site is being developed piecemealed.

Templates to Develop Planning Tools

A Template can be a valuable tool for learning about coordination.

Is it better to have functioning structure or template; there's lessons to be learned from both.

Newtok

Good to understand what has occurred, but what's ahead - is the problem. However, it might help to have the model and look at Newtok.

If we queried everyone involved with Newtok—could be useful for other communities.

Need to know all the funding streams and how to coordinate and access. Need everyone to coordinate.

Modeling and query should lead to identifying a red-flag to ensure deadlines aren't missed.

Identify what elements need to be in place—technical or financial, others – needs to be written down and / or in graphic form.

Allakaket

Also need to identify how to get everyone together at the table. Allakaket was a project where everyone came together - Tribal, city, state and federal in order to move structures. What we learned was that even when everything is going along fine – there's a great deal of complexity.

Proposed Action: John Madden will provide the IAW with the report about this effort - is very good and could be used as a tool and process as a guide.

Unalakleet – Public Comments/Questions

If Unalakleet were able to get funds from the state to match with Corps funding - when would we start? Some discussion about various target timelines – but then Steve (Unalakleet) asked about if it's

possible to get funding for projects while AK – DOT is conducting work in the community (airport), so the community can take advantage of using the heavy equipment while it's there - rather than paying for mobilization /demobilization costs. Everyone agreed that trying to time the capital projects to avoid additional mob/demob costs is worthwhile.

Proposed Actions for Unalakeet:

- Identify how much money is saved if equipment is already in place.
- Unalakleet should work with its legislators soon – state capital budget deadline is early April.
- DOT – Fbks (Gardino) provide letter of support
- Steve Ivanoff will be in Anchorage next week

Corps Draft Community Ranking Criteria

Carl Borash provided an overview of this draft document. Corps is trying to put together a way to prioritize communities since it's highly likely there will not be sufficient funds to meet the most critical needs. Senator Stevens requested the Corps to develop some means to prioritize – the criteria is a first step/try to address this request.

Discussion:

- Criteria important for decision making, but too early for this group to determine which criterion has the most weight. Necessary but not at this stage.
- We don't have all the information. The state may not have all the information. Determining how to rank is a question.
- Noted that the Corps already stated that the 2008 funding will be going to Kivalina due to Dire need and contract ready to go.
- Is there a way to review other community needs (e.g. portable clinic for Kivalina) and move it up the list to get done if equipment is going to already be in place.
- If the equipment is available in a village should another community's project get bumped because the equipment is in place and some funds can be saved?
- Clinics are planned for Kivalina and Shishmaref

Proposed Action: Denali Commission should determine where clinics are at for project planning/construction process.

Relocating Communities Sustainably

Allison Butler - UAF PhD candidate provided the group with a presentation on characteristics and examples of the need for sustainability, what sustainability is and how communities are integrating sustainability and sustainable design in their community (land use) decisions.

The powerpoints presented on this subject will be posted to the DEC - IAW Climate Change Website <http://www.climatechange.alaska.gov/iaw.htm>

Some of the key points were:

- Planning for sustainability requires policy guides.
- Initial costs are usually about 5% more, but the cost savings in the long run are tremendous.
- Energy – Alternatives in Alaska - Fish oil available - Bio fuels in western Alaska.
- Douglas Cardinal – Indigenous architect - <http://www.djcarchitect.com/>

His audio and power point is also available on the Cold Climate Housing Research Center (CCHRC) website: <http://www.cchrc.org/SNS%20Cardinal%20Summary.html>

- Vertical Wind Turbines are much less problematic like some in Alaska – they look like a solid object so bird deaths are few. Can be mounted on top of buildings.
- Numerous ideas for presentations to other groups were suggested.

- IAW may want to suggest policy on utilizing sustainable policy guidelines for erosion and relocation efforts.

Energy Atlas

Rod Combellick with DNR – DGGs, described the Energy Atlas – which will be a graphical depiction indicating where in Alaska the potential for energy resources exist and what type of resource is there. This Atlas is based on information that is currently available – not new/research. This project is likely useful to identify gaps, e.g. additional information needed to complete this inventory. This project is a collaborative where various agencies are participating and will be web-accessible. Available right around July 1, 2008, and will continue to add to it beyond that.

L. Hopkins provided information about a project in Fairbanks that has led to an RFP (for Combined Heat and Power) with the belief that the community could save up to \$300 million per year.

Meeting Closed at 3:30 pm.