

Immediate Action Funding Recommendations			
Community	Immediate Action	Budget Estimates	Action Taken
All Six Communities	<p>Develop Suite of Emergency Plans and Training/Drills (Alaska DHS&EM is lead) Emergency Operations, Community Evacuation, Hazard Mitigation Fire Management (Koyukuk only-DNR is lead)</p> <p>Purpose: Best chance to reduce loss of life and property when natural disasters occur.</p> <p>Coordinate with community planning projects to ensure dollars go as far as possible.</p>	<p>\$400,000 total to DHS&EM. DHS&EM will RSA \$25,000 to DNR for Koyukuk Fire Management Plan. DHS&EM will also provide \$100,000 federal funds match.</p> <p>Investment: DHS&EM estimates for every \$1 spent on preparation, \$4 saved in response.</p>	<p>Funds were included in FY09 Capital Budgets.</p> <p>FY10 Budget Placeholder: \$500,000</p>
All Six Communities	<p>Community Relocation Plan Funding for future relocation planning efforts for each community require coordination and resources both at the community and agency levels. Communities need funding and technical assistance to support/augment local capacities. Rational and collaborative planning needs to examine alternatives (e.g. shoreline stabilization/protection vs. relocation) and identify the opportunities for implementation.</p> <p>Training/Workshop to orient communities, agency personnel and contractors to the recommended collaborative community planning process.</p> <p>Cost Effective: When coordinated, Emergency Preparedness, Community Relocation and other community project planning and project developments have cost-effective results.</p>	<p>Partially covered in current budgets.</p>	<p>Immediate: Funds were included in FY08 Supplemental Budget for initial relocation planning resources.</p> <p>FY10 Budget Placeholder: \$300,000</p>

Community	Immediate Action	Budget Estimates	Action Taken
All Six Communities	<p>Reduce Capital Budget Expenditures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Through inter-agency and local coordination identify capital cost savings by aligning timing of projects requiring heavy equipment. - State should establish co-sponsorship funding to ensure Alaska attracts federal funds for its priority projects. - Find/develop Western Alaska rock source to reduce costs. <p>35% Funding Co-Sponsorship: Based on recommendations from Senator Stevens at recent roundtables and other meetings.</p>	<p>Immediate and Near Term Capital Budget Estimates: State should be prepared to augment federal funds with a target of 35% of erosion control and mitigation capital costs.¹</p> <p>US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) recommends the State of Alaska create a target of 35% to augment federal funds control/mitigation projects to ensure the highest likelihood that federal funds will be allocated to Alaska, given the competitive nature of these funds.</p>	
All Six Communities	<p>Preliminary Engineering and Early Coordination</p> <p>Funding will allow for preliminary engineering investigations to begin so that project development can move ahead in an orderly, timely, and efficient manner. Site surveys, material source investigations, hazard mapping, geotechnical and hydrologic studies, and environmental documentation and permitting studies will all need to be conducted prior to developing erosion protection or relocation design plans. Because all likely project scenarios will involve extensive environmental documentation and permitting, it is critical that the project development process start as early as possible. Will also allow for early coordination between agencies and affected communities and a review of existing data, reports, and plans.</p>		<p>\$600,000 to ADOT/PF was included in the FY09 Capital Budget.</p> <p>FY 10 Budget Placeholder Request: \$500,000</p>
All Six Communities	<p>Identify and Develop a Data Strategy to support Subcabinet decisions that need to be made for erosion control and relocation projects.</p>	<p>Address as part of the Subcabinet Climate Change Strategy. Subcabinet budget requested in FY08 Supplemental.</p>	

¹ March 24, 2008 Email from P. Ophoen, USACE Alaska District: Water Resources Development Act of 1986: the following sections set the basis for the USACE cost sharing policies including in both the Planning Guidance Notebook and the Digest of Water Resources Policies and Authorities. Section 103 mandated cost sharing for construction of flood control and other purposes. Section 104 mandated cost sharing for feasibility studies, and preliminary engineering design (PED). It states in part that (para (a)(1)) "The Secretary shall not initiate any feasibility study for a water resources project after the date of enactment of this act unto; appropriate non-Federal interests agree, by contract to contribute 50 percent of the cost for such study...". It further states in paragraph (b) Planning and Engineering: "The Secretary shall not initiate any planning of engineering authorized by this Act for a water resources project until appropriate non-Federal interest agree, by contract to contribute 50 percent of the cost ...".

Although Senator Stevens has sponsored authorizing legislation to conduct coastal erosion projects for Alaskan Native Villages at 100 percent federal cost the authorization did not change budgetary policy or procedures, or the Administration's policies on mandating cost sharing for Civil Works studies, PED or construction. The budget guidance addresses non-budgetable (policy non-compliant) studies and projects by addressing them in what is known as increment 9 of the budget submission reflecting our capability to perform the work.

Community	Immediate Action	Budget Estimates	Action Taken
<p>Kivalina</p> <p>USACE Description of Need: 2000 LF is needed to <i>provide interim protection</i> for critical structures and residences on the ocean-side of the island while Kivalina plans to relocate. Anticipated contract cost is \$16M². USACE received \$4.9 million in Federal fiscal year 2008, which will fund 400 LF of the 2000 LF total.</p>	<p>Revetment/Erosion Control Project</p> <p>Near-term (next 18-24 months): construction of 2000 LF linear feet of rip rap revetment with a current estimated cost of \$16 M .to protect critical structures and residences on the ocean-side of the island where catastrophic erosion is taking place.</p> <p>Intermediate-term: construction of 1300 LF of rip rap revetment to provide interim protection to critical structures and residences at the lagoon side of the island. Estimated cost is \$10 M. Total anticipated revetment project is \$26 M. (protection for both ocean-side and lagoon-side of island).</p>	<p>Immediate Action – Capital Budget Estimate for erosion protection on ocean-side of island: \$3.3 million (35% of \$9.3 million in Federal funding³) funds a portion of 2000 LF shoreline protection for ocean side of island.</p> <p>Intermediate -term Estimated Capital Budget – \$9.1 million (35% of \$26 million)</p>	<p>Funds were included in the FY09 Capital Budget.</p>
	<p>State of Alaska serve as 3rd Party Reviewer for geologic aspects of USACE (Relocation) Assessment Reports Alaska DGGs as lead.</p>	<p>Budget Estimate: \$12,000⁴</p>	<p>Covered in current budgets or FY08 Supplemental.</p>
	<p>Relocation Feasibility Study Geologic Mapping (Alaska DGGs as lead).</p>	<p>Budget Estimate: \$180,000</p>	<p>Eligible for funding through CIAP funds or FY 10 Capital Budget.</p> <p>FY10 Budget Placeholder for ~\$180,000</p>

² The base bid for the project is \$3.9 M for constructing 400 LF of rock revetment, with a total cost of \$4.5 million. This contract includes four options to construct 400 LF each at approximately \$2.4 million each, if funds are received before Mar 09. A contractor mobilization cost of \$375,000 would also be required for the second year of construction.

³ USACE FY08 \$4.5 M + USACE FY09 (anticipated) \$4.8 M (two 400 LF increments at \$ 2.4 M each) = \$9.3 M. State-funded portion of approximately 400-600 LF at \$3.3 M will leave 200-400 LF of total 2000 LF rock revetment for ocean-side of island to be completed in FY10.

⁴ This budget estimate is only for DGGs review of geologic aspects of the COE's relocation assessment reports. Broader, full review would involve many more participants and may not be appropriate for DGGs to lead. For review of all aspects, I suggest DCCED take the lead and draw on DGGs as well as other appropriate agencies. A larger budget estimate is needed if this is the intent. (Rod Combellick, DGGs edits to March 20, 2008 draft IAW Recommendations Report).

Community	Immediate Action	Budget Estimates	Action Taken
<p>Koyukuk</p>	<p>Review Feasibility Report: Koyukuk, DGGs, ADOT/PF, and DCCED should review the USACE Recommendations Report to provide feedback/reality check to the USACE Report was recently provided to Koyukuk community. USACE representatives travel to Koyukuk to meet with community.</p> <p>Coordination Among: Koyukuk, USACE, ADOT/PF, DCCED, DHS&EM for preliminary engineering, planning, and funding strategy.</p> <p>Upgrade Existing Road: Ensure road is passable during flooding.</p> <p>Build Evacuation Center: Ensure community has an emergency shelter.</p>	<p>FY10 Capital Budget Estimate: \$800,000.</p> <p>FY10 Capital Budget Estimate: \$4.5 million.</p>	<p>Covered in Current FY09 Capital Budgets.</p> <p>For FY08 & FY09: Covered in current and/or FY08 Supplemental (Community Planning grants and DHS&EM Emergency Planning Training).</p> <p>FY10 Budget Placeholder: \$800,000</p>
<p>Newtok USACE Status: Designs are underway for the road from the barge landing to the evacuation center at the new town site for Newtok. USACE does not currently have funding to construct the road which is estimated at \$5 million.</p>	<p>Build Staging Area for Barge Landing – Ensure ability to receive supplies.</p> <p>Coordination Among: Newtok, USACE, ADOT/PF, DCCED, and the Newtok Planning Group to determine what road standards are needed (purpose – construction costs may be less than FY10 estimate). Coordination expanded to Navy to determine if building Evacuation Shelter can be used as a training exercise (Navy has indicated they may be able to provide labor).</p> <p>Build Road to Evacuation Site – Ensure community has access to shelter (2.5 miles).</p> <p>Build Evacuation Shelter – Ensure community has an emergency shelter (approx 4,000 sq ft + 2,000 sq ft equipment shelter).</p>	<p>FY09 Capital Budget Estimate: \$279,000. For FY08 & FY09:</p> <p>Capital Budget Estimate: \$3.75 million.</p> <p>FY10 Capital Budget Estimate: \$4.5 million.</p>	<p>Funds were included in the FY 09 Capital Budget for construction. Planning funds were included in the FY08 Supplemental Capital Budget.</p> <p>Partial funding was included in the FY 09 Capital Budget.</p> <p>FY10: Budget Placeholder \$2mm; Federal - IRT leverage \$3.5-\$4 million</p>

Community	Immediate Action	Budget Estimates	Action Taken
Shaktoolik	<p>Preliminary Relocation Site Assessment for relocating village.</p> <p>Evacuation Road</p> <p>Coordination Among Shaktoolik, Kawerak, Federal, and State Agencies: Funding, design, etc.</p>	<p>Budget Estimate: \$150,000</p> <p>Budget Estimate: Likely have an estimate by Fall 2008 after reconnaissance work completed.</p>	<p>Eligible for funding through FY08 Supplemental for Community Planning Grants.</p>
	<p>Relocation Feasibility Study Geologic Mapping (Alaska DGGS as lead)</p>	<p>Budget Estimate: \$180,000</p>	<p>Eligible for funding through CIAP funds or FY 10 capital budget. FY10 Budget Placeholder for ~\$180,000</p>
<p>Shishmaref USACE Description of Need: The washeteria and lagoon are not protected by the 700 LF USACE has under contract to install. the length was determined by funds availability. USACE anticipates the contractor will demob. Fall 2008 or early Spring 2009. The next 750 ft increment of rock revetment design is estimated at \$9 million for construction cost, which would protect homes and a church. Another 550 feet of rock revetment is needed to protect the washeteria and the sewage lagoon. There is also a need to extend the protection on the southern end of the village where the existing reveted area ends.</p>	<p>Funding Strategy Coordination: Shishmaref, USACE, ADOT/PF, and DCCED</p> <p>Revetment/Erosion Control Project 700 ft section that will provide protection to the North shore including the washeteria and sewage lagoon. USACE estimate: – \$8.7 million for 700 ft.; \$25 million for remaining project.</p> <p>FY10 State/Federal Coordination: USACE will contribute \$500k for design of final stages of erosion control revetments if State contributes the final \$3million for construction.</p>	<p>FY10 Capital Budget Estimate: \$8.5 million (35% of \$25 million). Recommendation for funding needed in Capital budget FY10-FY11.</p>	<p>For FY08 & FY09: Covered in current and/or FY08 Supplemental.</p> <p>FY10 Budget Placeholder: \$3 million</p>

Community	Immediate Action	Budget Estimates	Action Taken
<p>Unalakleet USACE Status: Design for 1500 ft is complete. No funds are available to initiate construction. Real Estate actions are advanced and if federal supplemental funds become available in Summer 2008, USACE could advertise.</p>	<p>Revetment/Erosion Control Project Coordination with ADOT/PF's 2008 Airport Erosion control project.</p>	<p>Immediate Action Capital Budget Estimate: \$5 million (35% of \$13.5 million project).</p>	<p>Included in the FY09 Capital Budget.</p>

DRAFT