

**Climate Change Immediate Action Workgroup Meeting
December 22, 2008 Anchorage, AK
Convened: 10:20 am**

Communities and individuals participating by phone:

Fairbanks: Rod Combellick (DNR-DGGS)

Kotzebue:

Kivalina:

St. Michaels:

Nome: Bobby Schaeffer

Newtok: Stanley Tom

Shishmaref:

Koyukuk: Cindy Pilot

Unalakleet/Shaktoolik: Steve Ivanoff

Point Hope: Steve

Juneau: Mike Coffey, IAWG Member/ADOT

Elim: Christine Amaktoolik

Golovin: Toby Anungazuk, Jr

Anchorage:

Taunie Boothby (DCCED/DCRA)

Jackie Poston (ADEC)

Margit Hentschel (Walsh Environmental)

Dave Johnston (MMS)

Sylvia Kreel (DNR-DCOM)

Anchorage In-Person:

IAW Members

Amy Holman (NOAA)

Luke Hopkins (AML)

Mike Black, Co-Chair (DCCED)

Bob Pawlowski (Legislative Representative to Denali Commission)

John Madden (DHS&EM)

Trish Opheen (USACE)

Public and Agency Participants

Andy Jones (DMS&EM)

David Kang (DHS&EM)

Kolena Momberger (DEC)

Sally Russell-Cox (DCCED/DCRA)

Erik O'Brien (DCCED/DCRA)

Robin Bronen (UAF)

Darcy Dugan (Yale/Girdwood)

Stefan Milkowski (Fbks- Independent Reporter)

Margaret (Meg) King (MJ King & Associates)

Self-introductions were made and the facilitator reviewed the agenda.

During the agenda review it was requested that Co-chair Black review the IAWG capital recommendations that are now formally in the Governor budget.

It was also stated by a community member that having an opportunity to talk with the IAWG-DNR Representative regarding permitting for material excavation that then leads to community vulnerability would be appreciated and wondered if he would be available at the AK Forum on the Environment.

Review of Governor’s Capital Budget Submission to Legislature

M. Black reported that the IAWG projects included in the Governor’s budget were:

- \$3mm for Shishmaref revetment, which USACE also has funds for
- \$2mm for Newtok and construction of an emergency/community shelter. This project also has funding from federal agencies
- \$800,000 for Koyukuk road design to ensure it is passable during storms
- \$300,000 for Community Planning funded through DCCED/DCRA
- \$500,000 for Dept. of Transportation early project coordination
- No funding for DHS&EM

Members did not believe there were any IAWG related items in the Operating Budget.

Due to the continuing reduction in \$’s bbl of oil, it was also acknowledged that the budget will likely be seriously scrutinized by the Legislature.

Criteria for Selecting New Communities/Projects for Immediate Action

Immediate action due to a next storm (which was inevitable) has a high likelihood to result in destruction of public infrastructure, and/or loss of life, and/or loss of private structures.

Discussions about identifying the criteria have been the topic at several IAWG meetings, but they still haven’t been identified. To ensure this was a topic that the IAWG should continue with, the facilitator asked the IAWG members to talk about whether the IAWG was the appropriate group to identify the criteria or if it was for another, e.g. the Subcabinet.

The IAWG responded with certainty it was the appropriate and most knowledgeable group to address/identify criteria.

A summary of the discussion follows here.

The Blue font identifies those areas of the conversation that are part of the developing IAWG assessment process to identify communities with immediate needs and action steps to address.

Yellow highlights – are primarily actions.

The group started by a brief review of the IAWG process – which had included utilizing the GAO- identified communities, USACE’s Baseline Erosion Assessment and MVA’s identified regions and communities. DOT sent in lists of projects with either shoreline and/or projects in the initial 6 communities. AML also issued a call for communities/projects and those coming forward were White Mountain – wildfire issues and Point Hope—erosion.

The DCCED/DCRA contributed its list this morning with 25 identified communities, 17 of which do not show up on the others’ lists. These communities were identified by field staff, including Village Safe Water and AIDEA. Who have a good knowledge of the communities and their needs. The list is not prioritized, only alphabetized. The email was sent on 12/5/08 to field staff requesting their assistance to identify communities in need. That email can be found on the last page of this summary. The communities identified from this process were:

- | | | |
|------------|----------------|---------------|
| Akiak | Golovin | Napaskiak |
| Alakanuk | Hooper Bay | Nelson Lagoon |
| Atmautluak | Kotlik | Nightmute |
| Buckland | Kongiganak | Nunum Iqua |
| Chefornak | Kwethluk | Nunapitchuk |
| Deering | Kwigillingok | Tuntutuliak |
| Diomede | Little Diomede | Seward |
| Emmonak | Napakiak | Wainwright |
| Wales | | |

J. Madden noted that 119 communities had experienced flooding and it will happen again if given the right conditions, as for the risk of flooding...there are over 400 communities. But the risk variability is extreme. Some are in eminent danger where storms could destroy the community or the progress is moving to that outcome. Infrastructure at risk—there are 120 communities. There's a causal relationship.

T. Opheen asked: Who will be better qualified—who can best describe the situations?—This group is the one with the brainpower and better suited to define.

J. Madden: If we fail to act, will there be a threat to safety and life in the next 12-18 months? With all these lists, we could just have a list and no action. Regional approach doesn't work for specific community projects like a rock revetment. Reduce risk to mitigate. Can't do this for all 400 communities in Alaska. [Need to recognize that community is the unit of analysis, but a project is the unit of action – for which action means moving towards ensuring there is not a loss of public infrastructure or life, which likely could happen in the next 12-18 months. Need to know what infrastructure is in a community and identify threats to life. \(DCRA Database\)](#)

Andy asked if we have we asked the community leaders. M. Black responded that the identification of problems has come from communities.

J. Madden reflected on the various lists that have been identified. He suggested that the lists need to be aggregated and the IAWG needs to have a system that examines the communities and the potential projects that then leads to wise decisions.

Mike C—agreed that this for IAWG to do - Trish hit it on the head. We're the ones who need to do this.

L. Hopkins identified one concern—when we add Climate Change—we need solid parameters, State Forestry doing a study for a few communities and threat to life and wildlife. Need an accountability of the Climate Change measurements of what the components are.

Bob P. asked how many communities are already through the Hazard Planning (DHS&EM) and now under DCRA—for some type of community planning. Who has taken steps—such as capital project commitments—public infrastructure investments that need to be maintained, upgraded, etc. [IAWG—offers an opportunity to identify the infrastructure in a community and identify a process to maintain/support that infrastructure that can also then protect lives. John agreed. -- Identify hazards, services needed/available to mitigate those that can – need a community assessment.](#)

Mike B. talked about MiniGrants and the IAWG could do is to assist DCRA (S. Cox lead) with the scope of need/work for a community as there's only have a limited amount of funding with the Mini grants. Developing a process, then for a community – e.g., unit of assessment – need to understand: nature of issue, threat, imminent nature of threat, ways to mitigate threats. S. Cox added that not all communities have the ability to apply for a grant (don't have the knowledge of the process, or may not speak up). Try to decipher based on applications from communities to determine and define what information is critical for us (DCRA) to look at. Communities have to apply for mini-grants/assistance. We presume that they have a reason and proof of why they need a grant. That's the process to build the evidence.

John— Reflected that first ID communities, then ID priority projects. Not prioritize the communities.

Mike B. Need sponsor of the capital projects for a community.

Bob P. Need to also look at role of federal agencies:

—Regional/Expedited - Programmatic EIS --- get the federal government more involved.

---Land Exchanges too.

---IAWG could start process, possible [policy](#) to recommend up to the Sub-Cabinet.

Trish. We need to know what we need to accomplish—don't know about capital projects being proposed/conducted in a community; if they are or aren't the best method to protect—and still need to define whether the community should stay, relocate, or some form of migration. Need as assessment to help define the parameters and then projects.

Unit of Analysis is the community as a whole. The steps/process the group began to identify were:

1. Need to identify list of communities where there's reason to suspect/believe climate change impacts are occurring in their communities. Then if immediate actions could protect and how. This likely requires multi-agency discussions/coordination. Source: Lists from various orgs (see 4a below).
2. Need to identify parameters/options/process to address, including identifying relocating or staying, and if relocating what needs to happen to ensure safety until such time a move is possible, e.g. Newtok. Part of this is to coordinate with other agencies or funding sources to leverage and coordinate funding to ensure effective planning and implementation. Capital projects should move on an holistic approach and fit within parameters IAWG recommends. How can we ensure immediate actions can be taken?

Parameters	Limitations	Options	Protection
Suite of Emergency Mgt/Haz Plans and Community Assessments	Emerg Mgt – only to protect what is there – nothing on new/relocations	Stay – In Place	Transportation for Safety
Integrate capital projects		Relocate	
Return on investment/sustainability		Migrate (partial move?)	
*Permits (Expedited /EIS) (possible model DNR large projects)			
Land Exchanges - Expedite			

3. Hazard Assessment & Mitigation Planning (HA&MP), by Homeland Security, which could then hand off information to DCRA and others – need to identify/describe how this can be done.
4. DCRA can then issue mini-grant assessment to a community. This initial assessment may not need to be as expansive as has been envisioned as some of the initial community planning will likely have been done by HA&MP. Outcome: Nature of issues and threats, how imminent the threats are, and identify projects.
 - a. It's anticipated that some communities apply on their own for HA&MP or Mini-Grants, but this process – by utilizing others – e.g. state/federal agencies - AHFC, DHSS too, local gov't and organizations (e.g. Kawarek, NWAB), and School Districts – should also be able to identify communities/projects that may otherwise not have the ability to apply.
5. Need to update the *DCRA Database(s) to create the fundamental information regarding infrastructure investments, proposed capital projects, and likely M&O needed. Need to cross list all capital projects with community lists/projects.
6. Need to assess projects across communities – prioritization process is needed.
7. *Immediate Action from IAWG is to hand off process: institutionalization, integration of community projects, sustainability, assessments and recommendations to Adaptation Advisory Committee and Public Infrastructure Work Group
 - a. Adaptation Committee looking for how to keep a community from becoming an immediate needs (A. Holman)

* IAWG should recommend policies for

Daunting task with lots of meeting

Luke will follow up with additional information about community sustainability.

This afternoon during policy discussion - IAWG process and community selection issues will be explored more. Including, range of impacts that are beyond climate change and the IAWG, and how to approach budgeting for operation and maintenance for public infrastructure/community safety

Others added comments about issues of concern/interest.

Steve I added that it would be good if Chris Maisch from DNR to discuss issue on taking materials from one site/community for another and leaving the original vulnerable.

Eric O'Brien commented about some of the projects in the Immediate 6 communities

Shishmaref---re-location site selection

Shaktoolik road

Kivilina—road, protective place option

Cindy Pilot—Question on Koyukuk—road—Airport to the High ground only?

Working with Eric and looking at what the community would like to do by conducting a survey and would like to elevate homes due to flooding. Need to have tribal office raised and private homes. J. Madden—Hazard Assessment—will be part of what our plans will yield, but won't be able to price out until a more detailed community plan.

David Kane stated that the HA&MP is completed for **Golovin and is on the website**. Can look at this as an example. It will be sent to FEMA—they will then review and a slim chance for funding projects/communities.

Toby from Golovin spoke about some of the challenges/hazards in that community.—lagoon, school.

David—familiar with the situation—completed Golovin Hazard Mitigation and Hazard Plan—the plan is on the website and provides grounding for funding in future. For project planning, design, engineering, pricing, identify return on investment – need a process to look at sustainability. Can be handed off to others – **unclear how handoff happens.**

M Black - Are there IA's for Golovin that Emergency Mgt has identified?

Sally C: Mini Grant applications available around March – perhaps add Emergency Mgt questions to DCRA process/grant application

David K. This should provide communities with plans and 2 potential funding sources-(streams).

Luke—**Other states have an Emergency Preparedness Fund – something for Alaska to consider?**

Toby (Golovin) asked about getting on IAWG's list. Steve I responded that Golovin is on the USACE list and region—Return on investments and protecting what is there. School—need to protect a recent investment.

S Ivanoff also spoke about

Unalakleet—city will use some funding to re-locate gym. Facility that we hope to find funding to move to higher ground. This would then be used for Evac Center. This would be a win-win if moved instead of torn down. M Black suggested this could be a project for the Federal Stimulus package – and should go through the U.S.Senators and John Katz (Gov's Office in D.C.)

Shaktoolik—Denali Transportation Committee will commit \$1mm for the \$3 million estimate for design of road. Kawerak has agreed to another \$1mm and are asking State to contribute \$1 mm to advance the design. **Meg get plan from D Cmns.** Steve will bring the reconnaissance plans to the next meeting; will also work with local legislators. USACE/DOT looking for material sites. Geotech costs are going to be astronomical.

Additional discussion ensued because of the estimated high cost - \$3-5 mm p/mile. Mike C followed up later in the meeting with a lower cost projection per mile—3/4 mile is \$1.5 million or ~ \$2million per mile.

This is a project that warrants an integrated approach to capital expenditures. Trish asked – what is the end vision – is it the same for all of us? If it is in the works – and can coordinate then it might be accelerated. Others asked: Where does the road go – to more than one site, e.g. landfill and potential relocation site (and evacuation site). What assessments have been done? What are the potential hazards/flooding for this road are?

Steve (Mayor of Point Hope) Erosion studies—never seem to get funding to do the projects—just the studies. We have flooding and erosion—we aren't listed as an IA community but we need to be. Elders remember the tsunami that covered the houses. With global warming we are having problems with our road. Trish: Daisy had been at the IAWG meeting in Fairbanks, but didn't speak before the committee – however it was determined that there wasn't an immediate need, but do need assistance in the long run. Steve commented that the community moved 30 years ago, but have lost a tremendous amount of land. Airport is located at the old townsite 2 miles away and we are about to lose it. This is the only transportation for the village.

Tsunami: In an email from A. Holman (NOAA and IAWG Member)

The folks from Point Hope referenced a Tsunami so I asked around. It was in 1960 and there is no height given for the wave when it reached Point Hope. The origin was an earthquake in Chile. Canadian wave heights ranged from 0.4m to 0.58m.

Luke H. requested the Mayor to gather any information/reports he can and send to him/AML.
Steve—can get information and e-mail to Luke.

CIAP – Potential Funding for IAWG Priorities

Presentation by Sylvia Kreel (DNR-DCOM) Coastal Impact Assistance Program (ICAP)

Will send CIAP 5 Criteria to Meg

Maximum \$18mm per State Agency.

Must show downstream/coastal benefits if outside Coastal Region. Sylvia reviewed information in PDF:

- Proposals from Agencies and designated Coastal Regions are due Feb 2
- Themes—community projects
- State Projects
- Admin Costs no more than 23% of the project
- Formal application on-line—several parts to it.
- For IAWG to propose projects—must go to one of the State agencies
- Applicants need to clearly state which of the 5 (choose only one-best fit)
- Must make a brief statement - one line no more than a paragraph how this project will benefit the coastal region
- Consider—project component—fill all of this out. Arguments need to be clear and strong.

Any consideration of leveraging other funds?

CIAP— isn't a state criteria; but Congress desires to have other funding from Federal Sources –cooperation w/other agencies—state, communities and federal – likes collaboration

Dave J (MMS)—no matching requirement—look at the programs—to see if can authorize or was authorized to meet match—Statutory provision.

Trish—USDA and Denali Commission both have that lose their funding tail.

Dave—will look at. Trish will contact Dave with USACE lawyer

CIAP Community Funding Communities that qualify for CIAP:

Newtok—no

Shaktoolik-no

Kivilina-yes

Agencies—need to sponsor

The 30% can go to the communities; DCEED will assist with the procedure; IAWG can make recommendations for communities to use.

Sally—solicitations will be this year

Clarifications ---- 35% automatically go out to political subdivisions

65% Direct to state of this 70% will be state agencies and 30% will be for everyone to apply for

Bob P. Commented that one area /agency that will feel a significant cut is Salmon restoration—ADFG will be applying for funds to fill gap. These will be on-going projects vs new projects which are IAWG-related.

What projects does this group want to take action on/potentially seek funding from CIAP?

- Baseline Erosion Assessment
- Geodetic Control & Mapping (NOAA)
- RAPIDS Database system to update infrastructure and capital investment information (credible source of data)
- Digital Mapping of Coastal Areas - Get information so don't have errors, and down to 2cm range
 - o Fit in with Statewide digital mapping and NOAA efforts — water and tidal gauges
 - o Identify agencies that have operational mapping components to coordinate/leverage
- Data Collection
 - o Bob P will provide M. Black with a statement/request for guidance to put before Sub Cabinet Chair about data collection and using CIAP funds (prioritized list). Will align with information/data needs IAWG is supporting to NOAA. (including newly identified letter supporting US Coast Guards forecasting + IAWG needs to analysis, type and condition of ice and how this helps to identify armory needed and lost subsistence opportunities
 - o Utilize full Sub-cabinet
- Expedited/Regional EIS process – (Claire Yeager)

NOAA Updates (Amy Holman)

In FY 2010—no new money, keep schedule to ensure in base funding.

Amy Holman followed up on NOAA interface.

Initial focus was on 4 items: 1)Tide, 2) Geodata, 3) Weather observations, 4) Ice forecasting

Will further flesh out general statements from the original reports.

Tidal gauges are now moving forward

Now wants to work on Geodata and Ice Forecasting.

Options being put forth to NOAA by the Coastguard on Ice Forecasting.

IAWG offered:

- Ice Forecasting isn't as important as analysis of type/condition rather than forecasting.
- IAWG will add to US Coast Guards recommendations to NOAA; DHS&EM will also provide additional endorsement
- Amy will get USCG written recommendations for IAWG
 - Need bodies for imagery work – UAF is developing; Bob P. says UAA has a position that can help with match for funding/work.
- Bob and Amy will work on recommendations for IAWG

Developing an integrated policy to coordinate agencies and help prevent communities from needing immediate action. (This is also a focus of the Adaptation Advisory Group).

J. Madden - Background: DVMA studies things that could go wrong, preparedness, prevention. *A problem with Emergency Management authorizations is that when there's a problem that is gradually intensifying – can't do anything; after a disaster – can do everything.* (Katrina, Mnpls – bridge collapse, Greensborough rebuild and Iowa). The model that seems to be most effective, and most relevant to Alaska is the State of Iowa's recovery, where 86 of 96 counties declared disaster. Model is of funding from all different programs/agencies. Created an executive office of "Rebuild Iowa" during a time of disaster.

Rebuild Iowa Characteristics of the Model

- Lt. Governor manages
- Small staff that
 - Assesses the communities,
 - Identifies potential projects,
 - Identifies proper sequencing,
 - Identifies what all levels of government can offer,
 - Prioritizes, and
 - Monitors to make sure things progress in proper order. Also applies to private business. Established 2 months ago
- Non-centralized and non-bureaucratic system.
- Implementation (planning and building capital projects) is through existing agencies/authorities
- It's now backing up to determine how to structure so it is a preventative/proactive function. Might be moved to Gov Office or OMB
- Executive Order establishing/keeping Rebuild Office issued 2 months ago by Gov – no sunset provision
- Information/Data is important:
 - One of the keys to success is knowing what is out there – integrated database combined with proposed new things/projects. Iowa identified what is out there by inventorying infrastructure, including looking at the new projects and how they fit/support economic/sustainability of a community/area.
 - This is being done by asking: What do we have, prioritize, work through recovery, what do we need, how to get there, establish a network for rational order of how things need to be done. Wise use of funding, building supplies, need may not be the easiest to accomplish, but that not easiest.
 - First thing IOWA did –identify what do we have; Second—what do we need

Comments in response to Rebuild Iowa Model

- California is just beginning this too; program has a broader scale.
- Many states (including AK) had a coordinating office and a way of communicating, post NEPA, without going to a full EIS. Comments back and forth between agencies. That model, prior to an emergency could be useful if can identify how to bring together and coordinate.
- It is timely for us to look at this issue. Cap & Trade will be coming, with funding. The Rebuild Iowa approach, if proven will be a good model or approach for coordination. Maybe worth having this as a recommendation. We need to have State and Federal Coordination.
- Luke-cap and trade—should go back to communities
- Who takes responsibility if \$'s are available? Especially with new program like Cap & Trade.
- Fed Roundtable that is a diff track. Fed agencies aren't coming to the Climate Change and are a major funding source. Need more integration and involvement from Fed level
- If good policy—then get it going, sequestration
- We need to education Sub-Cabinet to the issues and then have Sub-cabinet carry it forward. They need to know why this is important; IAWG needs to consider how it conveys this importance. **Likely best if we identify existing deficiencies with current process.**
- The State's priorities cross.
- Alaska has so many infrastructure decisions done on regional basis or agency basis:
 - ANTHC Clinics - School Districts – where schools are placed.
 - Rural Communities: - Federal Executive Roundtable
 - Tribes and Cities
 - Regional Organizations – Health, Housing

Action: John M. will develop ~ 100 word policy proposal—standing process by which infrastructure can be inventoried and assessed, with additional rationale to support policy proposal.

Also take Policy #1 last year and integrate and expanding out with new information to incorporate range of potential threats

- Through this process, gov can set the priorities. You will then know the ripple effect!! And adding the NOAA/USCG information will be an integral part.
- Then if someone wants to upgrade a school, then need to look at pipes, sewage, etc
- This goes far beyond the database
- Makes the case and why it's so critical for planning and how poor planning leads to problems/increased costs.

Draft Policy on Operations & Maintenance Funding/Budgeting (Identified as Policy #3)

Mike C—Difficult to get funding for maintenance.

- Once structure is built-how does a community get funding to maintain?
- How are they being inspected?

Found out in general for DOT—

We don't have funding for inspecting infrastructure –find out when a community alerts about a problem

We aren't sure of what the inventory of infrastructure is - We need to inventory what we have out there.

We aren't sure of its condition.

Levy in Heider

Replenish Rock before emergencywhat

Example levee in Hyder—only 20% of the structure is left and just found out that we own.

Need a pot of money that we can draw on:

To do inspections for infrastructure and facilities, and allow DOT to maintain in a timely manner.

E.g., beach nourishment—5 years usually have to come back.

Fund should be available to do design work, riprap structure, rock revetment rock loss to replace the rock - decreases the amount of decay; would provide a way to maintain rock

Staff are in main hubs in AK, however, we don't have personnel in smaller communities.

Comments:

- Whole piece weaves into what the communities need to do and the communities have the responsibilities to maintain.
- Not identified in community profiles—nowhere does it show infrastructure/transportation inventory or investment – should be in DCRA Database.
- Is structures maintained – could be around 50 years or more.
- Need something like revenue sharing -- # of road mile; feet of revetment/beaches
 - Link funding to lifecycle when appropriate
 - Fund that local and state can tap into –
 - Capital Funds—communities, other agencies and those that own the structures could apply for. As situations develop—to react and respond to allow agencies to tap on a routine basis to maintain infrastructure. Yearly maintenance costs—diff to come up with numbers (weather, location, etc)
 - If dedicated pot of funds—we could come up with a prioritization process. Need mechanism to prioritize projects.
 - Eligible for funds if a community had a certain type of structure—or possibly expand (revetment or beach nourishment)
 - Local—would need guidance from USACE or DOT—to ensure appropriate work being conducted – to maintain life of structure.
 - Solution—local gov responsible for—maybe factor into a revenue sharing formula. Doesn't help DOT if DOT project. It would benefit if local project.
- Perhaps based on Legislative districts, Capital matching grants, DOT

- Preceded Capital Matching grants—\$1500 per mile for maintenance. Need p/ft rock revetment formula to fund local projects. Agency still has to assist local gov.
 - AML is looking at funds that could be set aside so a community can tap and this is separate from the CIPs.
 - Politically trying to funding for maintenance, likely best bet is to go with the revenue sharing formula. Have a better chance. Whether overseen by DOT or some other agency is up in the air—would recommend DOT. Easier sell. Millions into protection—need to share – especially since DOT doesn't have staff/capabilities in all communities.
- Public Infrastructure Work Group is introducing lifecycle concept/recommendation and is ripe for recommendations/thinking coming from others, e.g. IAWG. Capital improvement funds—moving buildings vs maintaining.
 - Revenue stream—local may not have the expertise, should agency be in charge to allocate \$\$ and engineering solutions vs at the local level?
 - Whoever has the expertise—should be the responsible party funding—how they use the funds
 - PI Work Group: Emerging Policy - Protect what we have!! Includes operation, maint, retro-fits, etc.
 -
 - Infrastructure maintenance, emergency, quality of life needs to be protected. Needs attention—Huge topic for IAWG—how can we send a strong message? Are other states doing this?
 - How do we ensure there is and O&M funding for maintenance?
 - USACE and DOT must be thinking about its Ports/Harbors—and then turning over to local gov for maintenance.
 - USACE—no set rules. Harbors are diff than revetment.
 - USACE has a book of projects—we do know all projects in the Alaska District since 1947. We'll look at and see if we have anything useful.

IAWG will develop recommendation to Public Infrastructure Work Group and Subcabinet on the immediate need to support funding for facility/infrastructure maintenance.

Thoughts that may be included in recommendation:

- Protect what we have/already invested in.
- Erosion control structures maintained by considering the need and funding mechanism options.
 - Erosion control: Beach Nourishment, Large Rock revetments,
 - Funding Mechanisms: Revenue Sharing model; funded from Capital Budget
- Coordination of all plans for capital projects
- Investment in maintenance is an immediate need because of the need to protect public and private infrastructure
- Need an institutional (program) approach, not single event
- Copper River Hwy as an example of emergency funding

IAWG Meeting Change

Next Meeting on Jan 6th state at 9 am at Suite 602 Atwood Building
 Recommendations Report
 CIAP—group Plan
 NOAA update
 Debrief from Dan White
 John/Andy—Updates on Policy #2, Policy #3, PI

Dec 22 Meeting Followup

T. Boothby will provide email sent to communities to identify potential immediate actions
 Mike B—commented that without a systematic evaluation we won't know which communities should be considered IA.

John—Need some kind of cross referencing for identifying communities: Baseline erosion, some sequences to make others/Subcabinet awareness.

IAWG at Alaska Forum on the Environment

IAWG Co-Chairs and others will present on a panel Tuesday, Feb 4th beginning at 2 pm – 4:45. After that they will invite anyone who wants to talk/meet with members of the IAWG to do so after the panel concludes.

Public Comments

Steve I (Kawerak)

Golovin:

Clarified that the school at Golovin was re-built with a larger facility than originally there. School District could/should/worked with community before they built the new school. Land issues, restrictions, now flooding.

Shaktoolik:

Steve I asked M. Black if they had missed the date for being in the Governor's Budget to request "matching funds for Shaktoolik Road Design. "yes." Could send request to State's OMB Director, Karen Rehfeld to consider; might tell her that the \$1mm will be leveraged against \$2 million and ties in with IAWG efforts. CC Mike B.

Unalakeet:

Steve I—provided some history on the existing gym, and was suggested that could send request to Congressional delegation for funding from economic stimulus packet.

Toby Anungazuk (Golovin) Had questions about Golovin's Hazard Mitigation

Andy Jones (DHS&EM) suggested to Toby to give him a call so we can talk about the templates on Emergency Plans and next steps.

Cindy Pilot (Koyukuk)

Asked what can we do to elevate homes and Tribal Office.

Andy J. Hazard mitigation plan will work on project applications, but no guarantee of funding or what we can do, but we can assist you – it's a lengthy process.

M. Black suggested working with the Interior Housing Authority (IHA) ask them for assistance. New Executive Director previously worked for DCRA and knowledgeable about those grant programs – also AHFC.

Meeting Adjourned 3:50 pm

Referenced on Page 2 of this summary: Email from DCCED requesting assistance to identify communities potentially in need of immediate actions.

From: Boothby, Taunnie L (CED)

Sent: Friday, December 05, 2008 4:27 PM

To: Mello, Christopher P (AIDEA); Magee, Gregory L (DEC); Ruby, Scott (CED)

Cc: Jollie, Tara L (CED); Black, Michael L (CED); Cox, Sally A (CED); McKay, Peter J (CED); St Amour, Ruth R (CED)

Subject: Requesting your assistance on behalf of Deputy Commissioner Mike Black and DCRA Tara Jollie

Good Afternoon,

On behalf of Deputy Commissioner Mike Black and DCRA Director Tara Jollie, we are asking for your recommendations of communities that may need immediate action to prevent loss of life, health or great property damage. This list will be compiled for dialogue during the Immediate Action Workgroup of the Governor's Climate Change Sub-Cabinet.

We are requesting this input because you are the subject matter expert in your fields and your vast knowledge of the communities across the State. This experience is vital to the discussion and we appreciate your time.

Below is a brief summary of what has happened and what the criteria to consider when recommending communities.

On April 17, 2008, the Immediate Action Workgroup (IAW) released their final report and recommendations to the Governor's Sub-cabinet on Climate Change for the initial six communities experiencing climate change related affects, namely Kivalina, Koyukuk, Newtok, Shaktoolik, Shishmaref, and Unalakleet.

Currently the IAW are collecting a list of additional communities for discussion purposes on a potential second round of communities.

DCRA has determined our mission statement for this task to be the following:

Identify the next set of communities facing the most significant impacts due to climate change in the next 18 – 24 months, based on the following criteria:

- (1) Life/safety risk during storm/flood events
- (2) Loss of critical infrastructure
- (3) Public health threats
- (4) Loss of 10% or more of residential dwellings

Communities recommended to date:

Akiak
Alakanuk
Atmautluak
Chefornak
Diomedede
Golovin
Kotlik
Kwethluk
Kwigillingok
Little Diomedede
Napakiak
Nelson Lagoon

This list is not an inclusive list of communities affected by Climate Change.

We are asking for your recommendations of communities based on the DCRA mission statement for this task. Please provide your input via e-mail to taunnie.boothby@alaska.gov and tara.jollie@alaska.gov by close of business Dec 12, 2008.