

**Climate Change Immediate Action Workgroup Meeting**  
**January 6, 2009** Anchorage, AK; Suite 602 Atwood Building  
Convened at 9:05

**Communities and individuals participating by phone**

**Anchorage:** Stanley Tom, Co-Chair Relocation Committee

**Fairbanks:** Luke Hopkins (AML)  
Deanna Stevens (DDGS)

**Interior:** Erin Harman (TCC)

**Kotzebue:** Bobby Schaefer (NWAB)

**Kivalina:**

**St. Michaels:**

**Nome:**

**Newtok:**

**Shishmaref:** Brice Eningowuk (Shishmaref)

**Koyukuk:** Cindy Pilot

**Unalakleet/** Steve Ivanoff

**Shaktoolik:**

**Golovin:** Toby Anungazuk, Jr.

**Anchorage In-Person:**

IAW Members

Mike Black, Co-Chair (DCCED)

Trish Opheen Co-Chair (USACE)

Bob Pawlowski (Legislative Liaison to Denali Commission)

John Madden (MVA)

Mike Coffey (DOT)

Public and Agency Participants

Kolena Momberger (DEC)

Sally Russell-Cox (DCCED)

Erik O'Brien (DCCED)

Jamilia George (DCCED/Denali Commission)

Taunnie Boothby (DCCED/DCRA)

Andy Jones (MVA)

Steve Weaver (ANTHC)

Greg Magee (DEC)

Margaret (Meg) King (MJ King & Associates)

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



**ASSIGNMENT: Each agency needs to write its own update – accomplishments with the funding from FY09. For the report.**

- Tools:
  - Mapping process that Denali Commission has been looking at—could provide information. Provided the maps do exist - another tool.
  - The process of investment and planning, identify success stories.
- Goal of the report should be IAWG has been successful
  - If recommendation is for a successor—then the accomplishments—Committee done good, need Clearing house tool: successor needs to have these characteristics, filled gap by, sell to PI TWG, trying to make a policy decision
- **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:** Show what IAWG has done, accomplished with funds. AND indicate what has or will be accomplished. Tools needed.
  - Show success and set groundwork – Role of committee has been successful –clearinghouse, coordination, finding additional resources, leveraging funding; Done good – need successor organization – not an interim. Sunset IAWG – new paradigm for protecting and maintaining public infrastructure and reducing risk to life and health. Has lead to additional successes with Newtok and Unalakleet....
  - Need summaries/accomplishments from all the agencies, then can address if need matrices
  - **Guiding Principle:** Immediate actions should preserve the widest range of options, protect what we have and enhance (when cost effective).
  - Not addressing/deciding if should move or not. That is a much larger issue than what this group was authorized to address
  - Identified and allowed information/roadmap to get to the next step – served as facilitator
    - IAWG has been able to provide (jointly working with communities and agencies have provided
    - Cindy P— Without this group Koyukuk wouldn't have come as far along as we are. Still trying to identify options and make decisions. Without this group we wouldn't be discussing and moving along on the discussions.
  - Policy Recommendations – Need permanent/long term IAWG - like committee (O&M etc)
  - What has been accomplished with FY09 funds
  - Tools needed (**Recipe**)– e.g. process, maps (D Commission), DCRA Dbase, Gap analysis, handoff actions/recommendations to others
  - Approach to assess and take actions - What is needed, how it's done (**Blueprint/roadmap**)
    - Examples—Bringing IRT into the solution; Strength in numbers (e.g. fed and state agencies communities and others - ANTHC)—focus on.
    - Think about the message—if collaborate and understand and result in more effective and timely response. No one agency—before us could do this. Power, appropriations or solutions without hearing what the others have to say.
    - Things in Newtok probably wouldn't have happened without this group. These meetings have helped facilitate and move the funding/tools/solutions.
- (Recipe) Need to identify who needs to be included in permanent group. DNR needs to be here. Environmental permitting and mapping; BIA; School Districts; Need to list the player/members and characteristics that the successors in a permanent group needs to have
- **Need to identify and clarify strategic options –stay, migrate, relocate – for each a range of options**
- (Facilitator's comments on discussion below: Could be a table: Column 1- Phenomena; Column 2 - Related/Potential Impacts; Column 3- Community examples – probably need to use initial 6 only for this.)
  - Need to list impacts of climate change (different than phenomena). Comments were made about the need to define what is Climate Change: Needs to be some parameters that define climate change, but others indicated not necessary to define, but may be useful to describe impacts

- Forest fires—changes in vegetation—or dead vegetation from new disease—conditions seen as other than natural impacts
- Whether climate change or not these things will happen. As far as immediate action—they still we need. Diff pots of money but state will still need to act
- Build on perma-frost—temp reg.---long term weather—more records, details, data collection can then look at whether climate change or natural
- We don't have the science to determine Climate Change or not – but what we have is the knowledge if there's an imminent or immediate threat. Is it reasonably related to Climate Change? Open water, increasing seas—easy correlation.
- Loss of Perma-frost degradation and sea ice are easy.
- It is the other areas of direness that I am talking about. Another entity needs to define
  - How much is occurring? Impacts from?
  - What about disease - Due to change in environment
  - Do see in some of the communities—i.e. water sitting around, pathogens,
  - Can track the migration north such as ticks, birds, vegetation not seen before
  - Public waste, oil, have immediate, imminent danger
  - Kivalina has mentioned—honey bucket zone is now flooding 2x years now.
  - Wildfires—fires come through—immediate threat—keep list small
  - Thinning forests

Likely too much for report - don't want to have us get any less effective. We should talk about to successor—what agencies are doing things now—mechanism in place and happening, responding to

### Community Matrices

- Use last year's info—but different structure and add new information
- Need to capture: what recommended, what resulted, what needs to continue
- Snap shot recipe to address these communities; Reword what we have said
- Instead of new column have a heading and narrative and then have matrices underneath—pull out what accomplished.
- Sell the message—need, done, next step; Show what did, looking at now see.
- Agencies successes/use of FY09 funds - response-write up what has been accomplished 3-5 paragraphs—efforts agency took, leveraged against/with, collaboration, etc IRT folks
- Projects identified by EM's suite of plans

### Community Profiles

Review/be sure want to use the term “relocation” probably in other report sections too. (reframe – strategic options to address and mitigate climate change impacts)

Developed into discussion about “relocation” and how a planning process could/should work but why it doesn't.

*Mike B—evacuate community to a site, is it a temp evacuation or perm evacuate? Who decides?*

*Not necessarily at government's expense we should move an entire community. Legislative body buy into without a whole lot more information. If a flooding situation occurs—we could do.....*

*Sally—what are the immediate actions? Keep this in mind. Leading towards such things as relocation*

*Trish—any large projects all begin with small steps. Immediate actions could be some of the small steps*

*Sally—you almost have to have the assessment done. You need to address the needs of the community*

*Meg—as long as the IAWG be aligned with preserving options*

*Luke—looking towards relocation—IAWG—look at issues with relocation—mini grants*

*Sally—mini-grants—options for community to look at options*

*Luke—application of grant—rubber on the road for community and evaluate for Climate Change impacts*

*Sally—assess what the recommendations are. Community will then decide. ID, then recommend*

Steve I---soliciting mini-grants discussions in past—no single person focusing on re-location, we have been tasked as individuals representing our agencies/communities. We have capital projects that need to be aligned with an overall plan. Something that happens in a community needs to have the team in place. Meg—what is the re-location efforts

Mike B—thing that has hurt —no agreed to process or plan. Need to be understanding with all agencies involved—need a planning process—will never get there. If communities pick up own houses and actually begin moving. Rehab a school—or moving/constructing—all have to be players, involved and plan. Get to a point of agreement

### **Policy Recommendation – How to identify and address climate change impacts in a systematic manner**

J. Madden developed draft policy recommendation language to address how community risk assessments could be conducted in a way to identify climate change and other hazards. Without such an approach, e.g. **if an assessment is only focused on potential climate change impacts:**

The hazard assessments would be incomplete for any given community - which the State of Alaska has a responsibility to address anyway;

The hazard assessments would not identify with a high degree of certainty if a hazard is likely due to impacts from climate change as the comparison 1) across a range of hazards is incomplete, 2) across a range of infrastructure projects is incomplete, or 3) across communities to compare and to identify “most at risk” is incomplete.

The hazard assessments would not identify “most at risk infrastructure and/or communities”, because comparisons are incomplete. (seems redundant?) *This approach will yield individual projects to address “most at risk”.*

### **John’s paragraphs missing**

EM received funding to conduct comprehensive suite of plans for the 6 initial communities. Based on that experience, is now going to a model to develop these plans in a broader region – e.g. 5-6 communities at a time – this will be much more cost effective.

- a. Y-K Delta region, Western and Northern Regions
- b. **Delivered in such a way that all communities in that region have planning, training, funding, etc--\$\$ to accelerate the process (commissioner to commissioner) J- what does c-to-c mean here?**
- c. Outcome: methodological way to identify most at risk – yield individual projects
- d. Funding to Prevent: Federal Hazard Mitigation process with minimal funding to Alaska is already in place. For every \$1 spent, save \$4. **(Can we document this/citation?)**
  - i. Federal funding process is in place, with a state program to implement, but Alaska competes on a National basis for funding –which is limited. When do get funds, EM has project components identified/ready to go such as engineering, planning and priced out and prioritized
  - ii. For every Presidential declared disaster in Alaska—15% of the declared amount then comes to Alaska for preventative mitigation—but it’s after a disaster has happened. EXAMPLE: Most recent—retro-fit for Kodiak—seismic plan considered best in Nation. Examine—changing or uncertain environment will find more things out there.
    1. **A couple years ago, no Presidential disasters were declared and therefore, no funds were available. Only one declared disaster in last 2 years. Again \$1 saves \$4.**

- e. Draft Recommendation: Establish a State Hazard Mitigation Fund to provide reliable, preventative hazard mitigation funding (e.g. before a disaster hits) to minimize the damage for when a disaster occurs (e.g. risk assessment approach will document the “most at risk” then Alaska can have a system to look at regions or statewide to make funding/infrastructure investment decisions.

- 1. This is a means to carry out projects through consistent/on-going, planning and implementation

**Need 3 things to create/implement structure and process:**

- Regional suite emergency plans funded (potentially CIAP and D Commission; Cap and Trade is coming. - tool that can be shown to match \$\$, planning, etc. Start out by identifying this approach and fund assessments/suite of emergency plans
- Legislative authority to establish mitigation fund
- System/process to utilize fund if established – prioritize projects to mitigate *Climate Change* impact

All potential mitigation (generally construction) projects involve answering a lot of questions - need information to make good decisions, to ensure public funds are invested well.

Who will maintain? Replace? Who’s involved? And so forth.

Under current administrative and funding systems most infrastructure is viewed on an individual basis such as DOT, USACE, but other agencies, including communities are also involved and have a piece of the picture. E.g., paving a road one year, only to tear it up the next to put culverts in. This systematic approach requires a broader view, likely a longer-term review, to integrate all players with the various pieces of the larger picture.

EXAMPLE: Only state with a coordinated approach is Iowa due to statewide flooding and damages in the past year. Alaska has so many infrastructure projects being conducted by many different agencies—state, federal, local, and then the health corporations; it would be cost-effective for Alaska to have an entity/office that could integrate what we have (e.g. inventory infrastructure), who’s doing what (e.g. all the infrastructure projects in the pipeline/needed, and funding streams (integrate projects to get the most bang for the buck – example – take advantage of heavy equipment in a community and reduce the mob/demob costs. This will allow the State to be much more cost-effective by doing more with the funding that we have.

This systematic approach would benefit the State by:

- Aiding communities/region in preparedness and planning for disasters
- As a means to document all hazards, Legislature then has better/best information to make decisions
  - With a state mitigation fund, effective and consistent use of emergency/mitigation funds state could use.

This systems approach would:

- Define areas (John - what does this mean – I need to understand to be able to describe)
- Create statewide integrated system to identify hazards and mitigation measures
  - Analysis and data support say these phenomena may increase. Regional approach is the best way to approach the risks.
- Coordinate funding to leverage public investment – 1) Cost-effective public funding approach, and 2) Address issues before they’re a disaster – for every \$1 spent, save \$4

How do you know what to do and how to do it?

Andy—depends on the template and community—you do lose customization, but you can get information  
John—approach we have learned—go to hub communities so expenses not as great, but can bring in more communities when training, id, discussions, etc

Andy—bringing in communities work together, better utilize each other, great networking opportunities, sharing, guidance.

John - It's an approach we can plan for in the region—we could complete but it will take awhile. We could do process quicker if more funding.

Mike B: IAWG can recommend for next fiscal year (FY11)/ IAWG did recommend for FY10 even if didn't make it to the Gov budget.

Andy—this is the #1 thing that must happen.

Meg - IAWG figured this out last year. What will go in the report?

John—Focus on the areas that have the most disasters. IAWG needs to go on record. Let Sub-cabinet readdress. Find a friendly legislator.

Mike B—did find out through this process what we need and lack. Suggest a funding level, maybe get picked up in Capital Budget? Place holder—funding needs identified are accurate. We are committing a great deal of our dept \$\$\$ for this one element.

How would implementation work?

John—implementation would be doing workshops, etc. using template developed with initial 6 communities. Very straightforward. 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph and 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph

Jamalia—time involved?

John—within a year—any willing community for entire region 80-90%=very doable

Jamalia—known and id hazards—Denali Commission—think of a way to showcase this

Bob—need to bring up. Defer to Sally for this

Does this fit in a CIAP funding? Denali Commission should look at this; discuss outside of IAWG meeting the possibilities.

John—we need to have policy last year—new approach

Bob—would like to make sure we are clear—How Adaptation and Mitigation terms are being used

Adaptation-mitigation (reactive)

Mitigation—reduce effect (proactive – selling point?)

John—in DC at national policy effort - will be trying to make the case on National level. Try to change national policy to become more proactive then after a disaster has hit. How'd this go?

**ACTION:** Mike B. For North Slope—Hazard Mitigation planning funds may be available from NPRA \$'s DCCED look into

John—full range of hazards—address IAWG issues as well as all others. This approach works for all John who – and is there a need to identify them and inform them of this recommendation? E.g. AML

**Next Steps – Guidance/Recipe**

- Funding for and conducting Suite of EM Plans
- Evaluate Infrastructure – what's on the ground, in pipeline (Update RAPIDS).
- Which agencies could bring \$\$\$ to the table for various projects.
- Some \$\$\$ go right to communities, other depts.
  - Documenting \$\$ flow could be useful

- U.S. DOT – FHWA and FAA-all \$\$ go to State

### How?

- Roundtable or meetings of all funding agencies – 1 or 2 times a year
  - Body that can say if we build... we can ....
  - Make more methodical
  - Information and how to access
  - Development of process
- D-Commission MOU meeting might be a good way to put this in place
  - Jamilia—involved in the set up of this

**Mike—In report identify need, benefit, suggest mechanism - communication mechanism should be Denali Commission**

### Conversation about D Commission and its Role

D Commission absent from IAWG – need that representation from Federal side

Right now more value in the communications than \$'s

If effective communications – then \$'s will be coordinated for identified efforts

MOU Meeting in May – may need meeting before then to affect some of the approaches the IAWG has identified as effective

Important for D Commission to engage/play role in communications to avoid cross we get between agencies so that we can streamline, be more effective as we try to address hazards (climate change impacts) in rural communities. This is part of its original mandate, but hasn't been utilized effectively or deliberately.

JG: DCommission's draft work plan is missing a call for hazard mitigation. IAWG should make a recommendation to DC draft plan.

### **JG will draft recommendation for IAWG; need to off-line identify funding level**

Mike B—Talk with George to facilitate this along—assign an intern or someone to hear and implement idea. If we depend on someone else how to implement, facilitate, etc

Timely comments/questions. More important message for DC - State and Community are present and driving this, there's a Fed Co-Chair, now need to have other Fed agencies involved. DC needs to show up and participate fully.

### **BP – talk with George re: convene MOU group and participation on IAWG**

Senator Begich will be meeting with all federal agencies – he needs to hear the same thing from each agency – e.g. that coordination is needed – should be D Commission role - not sure he'll hear that.

### **Coordination needed:**

- MOU—mean becoming partners
- OMB—hasn't solved this. Not a precedent. Do it here, many ways to accomplish—need to
- strengthen the state OMB
- It is recognized in the GAO report (first one), Inner ties
- Results/lessons from H Katrina
  - Aftermath of a disaster

- AAG or Sub-Cab—take up. Words don't explain. Need white board
- State has had coordinating bodies, e.g. DGC – gov guide council; State-Fed land

We're talking about the here and now, but also talking about 5, 10, 20 years out—process needs to be made methodical

Example: Construction at Shishmaref—who's going to fund/ build school?, put in airstrip? What is the next option

Short-term—are only to deal with immediate, however, we recognize the longer  
One is Infrastructure; Also Body of Knowledge, e.g. RAPIDS and lessons learned

Dan White - mapping is working on

### **Public Comment 12:20---**

Steve Ivanoff —like conversation about having DC more involved—most efficient to utilize funds. Also need to have BIA more involved especially for Shishmaref and Kivalina—thinking about how to do this. How can we get them involved in this process?

Admin driven requests as a match or funding strategies

Cindy Pilot —question—Should we be working on anything?

Eric—have latest information from USACE—draft report has changed so much that info wasn't current—are re-developing and will be getting it to you. Avail in late Feb/March

Discussion ensued, during lunch T Opheen checked with USACE leads and with Erik, it was determined best to wait until late Feb/March. Review erosion, sewer/water, evacuation route w/ Andy's assistance while he's out in the village next week. Need to have informed response. **ACTION**

Trish—USACE perspective, advice is Koyukuk needs to have an engineering firm representing the community—use planning grant \$\$ to do this.

**Cindy—Another thing to consider—maintaining 2 diff sites. Can't continue to have old site as fish camp if "relocate" Discussion – there are funding / policies to this affect – USACE maybe even DOT has.**

Proposal for Guidelines: Ask for exemptions or policy changes with new administration – said he's looking for innovation – what works. If mixture of funding would we still have to follow those guidelines?

### **12:45 pm - Lunch Break**

### **Characterizing other Communities & Projects in Report**

Discussion about how this process would work

- Assessment of region – yield potential projects (unit of analysis in communities, strategy to analyze is a regional (or sub-regional approach) and unit of action is projects based on analysis)
  - Who then advances these projects?
  - by whatever means \$\$ to id, mitigation plans, how to carry out, recommendations, etc
  - Start process that will yield a way to show how finish project

Haven't looked at total Communities

USACE's baseline criteria can apply to other hazards

Through regional planning, ask for mitigation funds?

If a bill is brought forth and passed structuring a mitigation fund - may not get \$'s in the fund

**Getting Funding** for a Mitigation Fund with partners to apply for CIAP \$\$\$ for mitigation planning and implementation—we could recommend as an IAWG group to assist. Need to know that types of projects these funds would be used for.

- power supplies above storm surges,
- raise houses,
- buy lots in avalanche or flood zones
- 75-25 split
- Mitigate for potential pollution
- Examples of projects via FEMA,
  - Retro-fits of schools, road beds, property acquisitions in hazardous zonesUntil assessments done don't know future projects, but do have past
- Can identify for the 6 communities (Andy)

John/ANDY get me lists Stanley Tom?

Need 3 things to create process:

- Regional suite emergency plans funded (potentially CIAP and D Commission; Cap and Trade is coming. - tool that can be shown to match \$\$, planning, etc. Start out by identifying this approach and fund assessments/suite of emergency plans
- Legislative authority to establish funds
- System/process to utilize fund if established – prioritize projects to mitigate *Climate Change* impacts

### Potential Proposals for CIAP Funding to Support IAWG Identified Recommendations

- EM propose to CIAP for Hazard Assessment/Suite of Plans
  - IAWG support – by clearly linking to Climate Change Impacts
- Geodetic Control & Mapping (NOAA and DNR – DGGS)
  - DGGS will have to take lead – not sure if this is on their priority list
  - Bob P will draft letter for IAWG to support – general support for all these potential proposals to CIAP
- RAPIDS Database system to update infrastructure and capital investment information (credible source of data)
  - DCCED/DCRA apply
  - IAWG letter of support ??
- Digital Mapping of Coastal Areas - Get information so don't have errors, and down to 2cm range
  - Fit in with Statewide digital mapping and NOAA efforts — water and tidal gauges
  - Identify agencies that have operational mapping components to coordinate/leverage
- Data Collection
  - 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
  - Utilize full Sub-cabinet
- Expedited/Regional EIS process – (Claire Yeager)

Trish brought up another potential funding source – NRCS (USDA) for emergency watershed efforts. She will followup. (Property buy out along Bear Creek in Seward/Kenai area)

Also still unclear about how/if can leverage CIAP funds once go to state as match for Federal \$

Proposal/Guidelines: Ask for exemptions or policy changes with new administration – said he’s looking for innovation – what works. If mixture of funding would we still have to follow those guidelines?

Newtok—could be. Some communities do want to take down.

**Important to have outlined so community know what the expectations are – e.g. 2 sites. (note – if IAWG role is to preserve greatest range of options, then needs to address)**

### **Characterizing Communities in Report and Justification for a System to Assess and Identify Climate Change Impacts**

Mike—using a multitude of sources—we have found 58 communities that meet the criteria of communities in peril.

Analysis must be described (where check marks came from) One- four marks don’t show priority order.

**The list identifies immediate need to get information – e.g. conduct assessment.** With limited information/data and each agency using its own methodology to identify communities, the list provides a starting point, but lacks the rigor or system to identify climate change impacts and communities in peril with confidence.

- Show the Climate Change 4 criteria.
- Use GAO to illustrate each organization has used different methods to identify.
- Need to go with the regions or perhaps projects.
- Utilize Community list to show justification as to why we need to have funding for Hazard Mitigation Assessment and Suite of Plans, etc

In report -- Keep the table, explain the background, don’t have data/info to identify if climate change impacts of not, which is why Hazard Assessment/Suite of Plans is needed first.

**John—make recommendations that are rational. Total picture—doing for the 6. But can’t do for 150. Even with funding – what’s realistic 3- 5years if \$1mm a year?**

**This needs to go into report Andy—already have the plans in many of the communities—no funding for projects - but do have projects that need \$\$ At least 50 plans**

**ACTION: EM to identify which haz assessment/suite of plans it has and how/what help it needs to get plans on website – Newtok is on DCRA’s. (post to Public Web?)**

Bob—sets the stage for engineering, general permits v major permitting—adapt and protect infrastructure. Do we dive into a NEPA process or EIS?

Sally—looking at all the variables and make the process complicated. Goes back to the inventory—very important and would be so useful and helpful. Gap Analysis—can use in/during planning process.

Bob—large list of communities which need recommendations—Are they large or small—immediate/not, etc

Mike—already have some models with DNR, DCRA, EIS and funding source will help determine which avenue you can pursue. Land exchanges i.e. Newtok—took 15 years. Might need to point out and how to speed the process.

Bob—Stanley brought up—what is the need for evacuation, what infrastructure are you protecting and must evolve a process.

### **January 27 Meeting**

- Draw Assessment, Planning Implementation Process
- Reflect on how to improve IAWG process
- Bullets for Report - including projects within community
- What is needed in the report – it we have that then how it gets written isn’t the issue.
- Agency accomplishments from FY09 funding. - write and bring in their summaries/send to Meg/Mike

- Identify projects—as \$\$ become available—haven't used plans in this way before. Will be a building block for the next phase
- AFE: IAWG members (co-chairs) and others will participate in a panel discussion on Tues Feb 3—
- IAWG members recommended that communities have substantial time to participate
  - Background, what we are doing, how much do we need to show history
  - Need power point presentation
  - Looking at the outline for Forum---Newtok—lessons learned, where go from here
  - A piece of this should be handed to the communities—have the communities relate to what is happening out there - Real curiosity is the communities themselves.
  - Having them share is on the money
  - Is time allotted for community participation and comments?
  - IAWG members want this more of a priority
  - Trish: will be an informal discussion—no power point—just show up—kick off dialog—by asking question if aware of IAWG

**ACTION: ASK Jackie to meet with us so she can discuss the Forum—cohesive/coherent – 1/27**

- Identify if Communities should be prepared for IAWG/AFE with anything

Luke—AML—co conference—transformed into 4 separate sessions that AML will structure on Wed a.m. and Thurs—will see it on the AK Forum panel discussion.

Still looking for funding for travel for community members to attend. AML can't find to offer sponsorships

**Erik provided a quick rundown on projects for communities**

**Koyukuk** - Mapping—

Cindy—last time spoke with Bruce (USACE)—weren't able to take aerial photos

Mike—DOT needs to be aware

**Erik—Kivalina—**

Not sure what they wish to do. Will start to fill out community planning grant application.

Harvey Smith thought beach nourishment and enhancement would be beneficial.

DGGS did get CIAP \$\$ to do mapping—communities not yet identified for geologic and hazard mapping.

Communities need to be involved with this.

Erik—how early can this happen?

Based on emails from Rod Combellick – Meg said \$'s are available—will need to hire—but it will be happening

Sally—protect in place. Erik talked with them about the USACE v. protect in place

Erik—dump and sewage—flooding—into lagoon and then into community ANTHC and Village Safe Water are working together on trying to address this issues from erosion.

Mike---will talk to Greg Magee

Trish—Kivalina—is one of the communities USACE will be sponsoring along with Newtok

**Erik – Shaktoolik**

Road design, evacuation road—just came out from Denali Commission planning and design

Bob—prelim—design 500,000

Erik—Mike Sukiyak—road option, Sally—hazard analysis—assessment impact statement

Andy—Hazard mitigation plan should be approved this spring

Sally—really shows how our 2 agencies need to work together.

Eric—fuel tanks at Shaktoolik

Andy—next big storm—will take out at least ½ of Shaktoolik’s infrastructure

Mike—Elevate road 14 ft.

Andy—logs, sea storm, erosion—heavy amount of debris is in front of community

**BIG PICTURE RECIPE/GUIDANCE**

**Hazard Assessment/Suite of plans and emergency response**

**Community Planning – Identify Options**

Bob—evacuation routes.

**Public Comments: None**

**Meeting Adjourned: 3:40 pm**

DRAFT

## Revised Handout from 1/06/09 meeting – Bullets/Report Outline

- **Intro/Transmission Letter**
- **Revise Near-Term Focus to include changes to IAWG Mission**
- **Exec Summary –**
  - Revise discussion/text to include:
    - IAWG Successful – identifying integrated process to cost-effective implementation/construction, collaborative working relationship and action
      - Not addressing/deciding if should move or not. That is a much larger issue than what IAWG was authorized to address
      - Not defining what is climate change
      - Identified climate change phenomena from which impacts are most likely resulting from
    - Guiding Principles - Immediate actions should preserve the widest range of options. Immediate action: protect what we have and enhance when cost effective
    - Sunset IAWG, but create permanent working group/committee
      - Identify members (e.g. BIA, DNR, HUD?)
    - New communities identified – necessitating process
      - Other efforts to identify communities – BEA, GAO, DCCED, etc.
    - 4 major recommendations –
      - Formal, standing committee/workgroup to take on IAWG role
      - Strategic process
      - Revised/detailed 2008 Policies 1 & 2 (now become policies 2 & 3)
        - Additions to detail Policies 1&2, O&M and RAPIDS Database as the info source for capital projects/investments, MOU with D Cmsn/Mitigation Fund/Programmatic EIS/Accelerated Land Exchanges/Need to identify other policy and program hurdles –e.g. can't have 2 sites and options to address/DNR permitting issue for projects – esp for DOT projects
  - Add info (maybe table) to identify accomplishments made with 2008/09 Funds
  - Revise Matrices (Simplify – How?)
    - Update 6 communities – Accomplishments and requests for FY 10
- **Community profiles – add \$ Investment in Infrastructure**
  - What about the communities IAWG has heard from: Deering, Pt Hope, Golovin, Teller – add any profiles?
- **Immediate Actions 6 Communities**
  - Update Matrices and simplify to ensure readability
- **Additional/newly identified Communities**
- **Policies**
  - Renumber and add new #1 Sunset IAWG, replace with permanent workgroup, and #2 Strategy recommendation
  - 2008 Policies 1&2 – renumber to 3 & 4 detailed with more information about How to accomplish, identify steps
    - O&M policy
    - Database Policy – RAPIDS – and keep information current
    - MOU - D Cmsn Role – etc.
    - See Exec Summary section above for full list
- **Appendices**
  - *Should any 2008 appendices be kept; Create separate section for them?*
  - For 2009 Report, *which documents should be included in Append?*
    - Definitions

- Data Collection Policy Coordination with NOAA
  - Tide gauge priorities
  - Support US Coast Guard recommendations (did IAWG provide?)
- Identify Infrastructure Investment
  - DCCED RAPIDS Database ppt/and handouts
  - \$ Infrastructure Investment in Communities (Bob P. did homework/has spreadsheets)
- Efforts to identify communities needing immediate action
  - Summary of AK Flood Disasters
  - USACE BEA Exec Summary
    - Erosion community criteria - USACE
  - DCCED (email and response)
    - DCCED Mini Grant criteria
  - GAO 1- Page Summary Report
- Leveraging Other State Funds
  - CIAP presentation
  - Rasmuson
  - Recommended State Mitigation Fund –
    - Projects they've been used for
    - Projects identified in 6 communities
- IAWG August 2008 – January 2009
  - Meeting Schedule/Agendas
  - Participants
- Other Agency/Gov't Efforts Identified
  - Presentation from Canadian official at 10/28 in conjunction with Env Mgt Conf?
  - Denali Commission Policy
  - ANTHC Community Planning/Pilot Effort
- Nuggets/Summary of Public Comments

**Notes:**

“relocation” be careful using – if use

Terms “planning” and “process” are likely viewed as soft and not results/output-oriented