



Alaska Climate Change Adaptation Advisory Group
Meeting #5
Draft Meeting Notes
Friday, February 6, 2009 9:00 AM–4:30 PM

Attendees:

Panelists

Kris Ebi, Amy Holman, Chet Kablinsky (sp?), Doug Vincent- Lang

AAG Members

Elaine Abraham, Bruce Bothelo, Shane Montoya, Billy Connor, Terry Chapin, Amy Holman, Stan Foo, Jeff Demain, Jeff , Bob Pawlowski, Joe McLaughlin (phone), Peter Larsen, Tony Nakazawa (phone), Jeff Short, Bill Streever, Dale Summerlin, Mead Treadwell, Thomas Weise, Steve Weaver,

Staff

Larry Hartig, Susan McNeil, Kolena Momberger, Jackie Poston,

Facilitators

Barbara Sheinberg, Kris Ebi, Brian Rogers, Fran Sussman, Nancy Tosta, Jason Vogel (phone), Jan Caulfield

TWG Members

Don Calloway, Bob Gerlach,

Public

Tobby Amungazak, Aubrey Baure, Mike Black, Robin Bronen, Mike Brubaker, Rudy Bruggeman, Ashley Chappell, John Chase, Paul Doremus, Brice Eningowak, Craig Fleener, Erin Harman, Anne Marie Holen, Kris Holderied, Lisa Iwahara, Jim Jones, Robert Keith, Frank Kelly, Mara Kimmel , Linda Kruger, Debbie Larson, John Madden, Molly McCamon, Dave McMahan, Erik O'Brien, Sally Russel-Cox, Jeff Smith, Lisa Taylor, Ahsha Tribble, Michael Tubman, Dan White,

Introductory Remarks

Larry Hartig, Chair, Governor's Sub-Cabinet on Climate Change Commissioner and Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC)

Review and Approve: Design of Recommended Priority Options by Technical Working Group (TWG): [Natural Systems](#)

Jan Caulfield (Jan Caulfield Consulting), Facilitator

Presentation – Presented in order of ranking of options using six criteria. All eight options were strongly supported by all the TWG members.

Option 1. Incorporate climate change in to commercial fisheries management and assist fishing communities and users in adaptation.

Question: Fish and Game is collecting information for a variety of purposes. Isn't slicing out CC is a dispersal of that knowledge. Answer: the intent was not that fish and game would funnel all information through a center. Rather, the idea was to have a reliable, centralized source of information that folks could access.

Question: Is there a way to get industry involved there? Answer: in the independent commission, we do have the idea of industry and traditional knowledge both be involved.

Question: What types of infrastructure are you thinking about here. Answer: Ports, processing facilities.

Option 2. Review and modify Alaska's wildland fire policy and programs

Question: If we manage forests for wildland fire protection, can we do that consistently with managing them from a GHG mitigation perspective? Answer: In general Wildfire protection will give you higher levels of carbon sequestration, so mitigation and adaptation work in the same direction..

Option 3. Manage CC impacts on watersheds and din-stream flows

Comment: An effect that should be highlighted is hydroelectric power.

Question: Any talk that about water resources being exported? World will get thirsty. Answer: would fall within state's existing framework for water management.

Question: You said research is needed. What are we measuring? Answer: USGS gauges just a handful of rivers, and NOAA is involved in some gauging..but there are large areas of AK that we don't have any information on base flows in rivers, and how change over course of season, and so can't see what happening over time.

Question. If streams are warming, that will affect habitat of fish. Are we doing anything to look at stream temperature? Answer: There is a large stream temperature study going on. Lower base flows will result in lower temperatures. There are some recommendations to the research needs group that address these concerns.

Observation What about surveillance of increased pathogens in the water system. Is there any thought of rolling in some type of monitoring and surveillance system for these? This is nicely designed, and could dovetail with the HC TWG.

Option 4. Reduce introduction and spread of invasive species, in context of CC

Clarification: Concern is not so much range extensions, but leapfrogging of invasive species that would exacerbate the problem that we are already experiencing. Could have wide effects on range of economic sectors and ecosystems. A lot of what is in the option focuses on activities that the Invasive Species Council would do—providing strategic direction.

Question: When dealing with climate change, the problem lies with northern progression even more than leapfrogging. Is that in here? Answer: Yes, northern progression is not off the table. .

Question: Would the issue of cruise ships and invasives be in addition to laws about cruise ships and black water. Answer: the Council would look at whatever gaps there are in protection against invasive species.

Option 5 Review state regulatory process for wildlife harvest to assure timely adaptation

The problem subsistence villages are seeing is that—in wildlife regulatory systems—they cannot respond as quickly as needed to changes that occur to provide access to hunting/fishing sites. So the recommendation is to design a more flexible in-season system of regulations.

Question: would this be limited to subsistence users, or is it a more broad brush regional type of process. Answer: scope may depend on what the problem is.

Question: When there is an emergency change, it is only for that time and place? Do we address every issue? Answer: the next round will be to flesh this option out, with the goal being to be flexible and , informed by local knowledge.

Option 6. Prepare for adaptive management of fish and wildlife

Question: How do NS 5 and NS6 fit together? Answer: Could structure and link them for wildlife regulation. The other part – the information base – is broader than that.

Recommendation: NS5 should be for FISH AND wildlife.

Option 7. Develop capacity in new forestry and wood biomass opportunities.

Question: Is this a permit process? Answer: have to to do this at the local level.

Question: Are there any air quality impacts that need to be considered? Answer: That is actually part of mitigation options (2.5 PM standard)—if use the right kind of equipment, can meet EPA standards effectively. Older wood stoves do not meet those standards.

Comment: Could we with the tribes and make this a priority and emphasize for them the health consequences of burning wood. We have a high rate of children with allergies and asthma – highest rates in the country—and they are sitting here with these wood stoves. Recommendation: ADD: “and other tribal entities.”

Option 8. Support local sustainable agriculture in AK

CROSS CUTTING

1. Alaska Center for climate change solutions.

Discussion of this option covered overlap between this and the No. 1 option of the Health and Culture group, and the regional climate center for AK. Also similar to option that has shown up under the Economic Activities TWG.

2. Promote cc literacy through education/outreach

Discussion centered around how this could be a controversial option, and is also similar to an option being raised by the Cross cutting Mitigation WG.

SUMMARY: any objection to any of these options going forward?

1. No objection to going forward
2. Consider whether bringing option 7 into this makes sense or keep them as too. No objection as it stands.
3. Consider discussion as go to next round. No objection.
4. No objection
5. Add in word Fish Possible consideration of combining with NS 6. No objection
6. Could combine with 5. Additional comment: Would like option to be more specific – says “prepare for” not “carry out” – would like to see a recommendation that says “gather information and do something about it.”
7. Addition of consideration of health impacts. Another comment: have smaller trees that could be thinned and also used for fuel. There was exactly this issue that came up in mitigation—will make it to the subcommittee, therefore, but need to tag it here.
8. Add marketing

PUBLIC COMMENT AT THIS TIME:

Health issues in rural Alaska are current and happening right now. Discussed a range of effects, including *Echinococcus multilocularis*, which results in liver disease and can be fatal, and is moving because of climate change and so it may be moving. Erosion and sediment running down into the river is having an impact on drinking water of downstream communities. Some severe problems for health issues in the villages. There is some activity in creating a regional baseline assessment, conducting community surveys, implementation of a web-based monitoring and observation system, developing adaptive recommendations based on previous.

Review and Approve: Design of Recommended Priority Options by Technical Working Group (TWG): [Other Economic Activities](#)

Nancy Tosta (Ross & Associates), Facilitator

Focus on options that are looking at the economy of the state—rather than focusing on sector-specific options. Also felt did not want industry-specific technological options. Will see some options with similarities to those of the other TWG—and in particular what heard from Natural Systems TWG.

No explicit ordering. Option 1 had very strong support. All are similar.

Option 1. Evaluate Potential Needs for Expanded Arctic Ocean Oversight and Regulatory activities.

Option 2. Explore Economic Activity Opportunities offered by climate change

Comment: AK is facing the need to adapt faster than many places in the US---can that knowledge being developed be something that can leverage and export and perhaps generate jobs from.

Question: This option focuses on opportunities. What about the problems that industries will be facing and possible loss of jobs? Answer: The option did not focus on this. But see page 5 of handout for focus on both opportunities and risks.

Summary: Need to coordinate between EA and NS with a focus on areas where may have negative impacts associated with NS.

Option 3. Develop scenarios for the AK economy affected by climate change

Question: Option 2 talks about potential benefits, but Option 3 says we don't know enough to know whether there will be problems/windfalls. Why do we really think there will be a windfall? Reconsider the order of these two. Answer: in Option 2, write-up says we need to do option 3 first.

Question: Has there been any discussion about what types of infrastructure will need to be in place to respond and do what we need to do as a state? Answer: For many industries, not that much is under state control

Option 4. Center

Observation: This is similar to the option from the NS TWG. This idea of a virtual center is pervasive. Not a data center, but a center for coordination. Should consider it being a bricks-and-mortar center.

Observation: Traditional knowledge should be integrated into these studies.

Option 5. Improve availability of mapping, surveying, charting, and imagery data.

Observation: This option would be strengthened by referring to the underlying work that needs to be done that needs to have to get it underway.

SUMMARY

Option 1. No objection.

Option 3. Move this before Option 2. Both positive and negative effects on the economy.

Option 2. Exploring opportunities. On second slide : change "EO" to "state action."

Objects because language is too optimistic as a view of funding opportunities. Needs to be: things are bad, but there may be a few trickles.

Not consensus item, but will need working to get to approval. Tack a modified version of option 2 onto Option 3.

Option 4. Consensus that want a cross cutting group looking at this issue.

Option 5. Mapping surveying and charting (with a bit more work on the charting and getting more folks involved). No objection. Caution: this could be a cross cutting issue.

Update on Research Needs Workgroup

Doug Vincent-Lang, Co-Chair, Research Needs Workgroup

Working at a broader level and a set of recommendations from the TWG and the TWG liaisons.

Each RN will be tied back to one or more policy recommendations from the TWG database

Wants feedback from a wide group – as wide as possible.

Are we prioritizing? Only if see a really big gap that needs to be filled. Otherwise will wait and see what the subcabinet says and what it's priorities are.

Review and Approve: Design of Recommended Priority Options by Technical Working Group (TWG): [Health and Culture](#)

Kris Ebi (ESS, LLC) and Jason Vogel (Stratus Consulting), Facilitators; Jeff Demain (Allergy, Asthma and Immunology Center of Alaska, LLC) and Don Callaway (National Park Service, Alaska Region), TWG members

Kris: identified top 10 options. Very strong consensus across the group—everyone on board for all the options. Still in process.

Option 1. Identify a central ombudsman agency.

Observation: This Ombudsman office has long list of actions for it. Response: the option advocates a central node that coordinates and acts as a communicator of multitude of voices to the community.

Comment: Be careful about language. In Alaska state government “dedicated fund” has a specific meaning—requires a constitutional amendment—when all you really need is a long term, reliable funding source/stream.

Comment: One of the most important issues that villages face is how to deal the vicious circle of trying to get things done.

Comment: This group should be looking at these issues from a community/cultural sense. Focusing on communities that need to relocate or other overlaps with PI or IAWG should be addressed by that group, subsistence goes elsewhere.

Observation: This seems to go across the workgroups—part of what is going on with the Immediate Action Work Group.

Option 2. Augment Surveillance & Control programs for infectious diseases.

Some discussion occurred of possible partnership with the option from the Natural System workgroup.

Option 3. Purpose is to make sure that health impacts of other activities are taken into account.

Option 4. Address risks to rural sanitation and solid waste management

Observation: there is overlap here with the Public Infrastructure TWG.

Option 5. Archaeological and cultural issues

Discussion of how this office would relate to the traditional councils.

SUMMARY OF OPTIONS

Option 1.

Need a cross cut between IAWG and this group. Who will take the lead on which part of the recommendation.

Coordination on Recommendation #9 – combined with opts 5 and 6?

Option 2:

No objection

Option 3

No objection

Option 4

No objection

Option 5

No objection

Review and Approve: Design of Recommended Priority Options by Technical Working Group (TWG): [Public Infrastructure](#)

Barbara Sheinberg (Sheinberg Associates), Facilitator

The approach in this sector goes from protect what we have; build new things to standards that sustain themselves in an environment of uncertainty

Observation: if you are going to predict the future, you must predict uncertainty.

Question on the “build to last” theme: How long are you thinking? The relevant number of years differs from a house, a dam, or other structure.

Observation: Important to have consistency between IAWG and PI. IWAG has talked about using the “No regrets” theme.. No comments.

CROSS_Cutting Issues

One or two members of each group—collaborate on CC-1 – “Solutions”

Some discussion of alternative names: “Center for CC Studies” “C for CC Advocacy for PI and Peoples”.

CC-2: tribal as well – take word ‘state’ out.