

POLICY STATEMENT #1 GROUP MEETING | May 21, 2018 | 3:00-4:00PM

Participants

CALT: Luke Hopkins, Chris Rose, Molly McCammon, Meera Kohler, Lisa Busch, Reggie Joule, Denise Michels,

State: Mark Wiggins, Heidi Hansen, Alice Edwards, Danielle Meeker, Nikoosh Carlo, David Rogers,

Other: Denise Pollock (AIJ),

Dialogue

Nils Andreassen : Our goal is to discuss policy statement #1. Goal is to get feedback on policy statement and associated goals and objectives. I'd also like to get a feel from this group for next meeting time.

Generally speaking, this statement is very much focused on adaptation, working with communities to identify risk, helping them with planning, engaging research and reviewing related State activities. It's fairly broad, but has a lot of good content in there. At the heart of it is ensuring safe communities in the face of climate change. Does this policy statement capture a lot of the role of the state in adaptation and community support?

Luke Hopkins: Appreciate the term "sustain communities". We have the word "response" in the statement...."sustainability" may cover a lot more actions than just response and may cover our four goals under the policy statement.

Meera Kohler: I have a question. When we say "coordinate governance", what do we mean by "governance"? It seems to overlay community efforts. Is the state going to take the lead role?

Andreassen: We're looking at what the state can do. It can pull together other levels of government, work as an intervener/community/facilitator. More of a coordinating role to respond to the interests of local/tribal/community governance. Supporting without telling communities what to do. I know that it means different things to different people. Really talking about having the state as a facilitator in some sense.

Molly McCammon: I wonder if what we're looking at "enhancing xyz", with coordination underneath that as a goal. We want the state to be more proactive and enhance efforts, not just coordinate.

Lisa Busch: I agree, this seems too vague:.

Andreassen: These are intentionally vague and waiting for your input. I see Molly's suggestion of replacing "coordinate" with "enhance" and then adding more language elsewhere. Any other thoughts elsewhere? We tried to be succinct. We want to focus on key words and then build it out.

Kohler: I'm confused about the sentence. It sounds like the government efforts to help the community as they develop their risk and resilience plan?

Andreassen: Yes. What we heard from a lot of the members is that the State has some role in setting policy and having a statewide plan, but we also want to increase what's going on at the local level and strengthen that at the state.

Kohler: So the outcome really is a solid community plan, including an assessment of their risk and a comprehensive plan. Our role is then to focus on what we can do to meet the goals of that plan.

Andreassen: The goals then flow from that. The goals talk about empowering communities, State engagement, etc. Some of that gets back to the work of the Denali Commission and UAF. Our goal is to assist with climate proofing.

McCammon: It doesn't really say that.

Andreassen: Right.

Busch: I have a question about the first goal. Under 1.1c, "increase community capacity...", the thing I don't understand is reducing regulatory licensing and contracting barriers. Where did that come from?

Andreassen: It came from someone saying something to the effect of communities could be doing more, but there are barriers to doing more.

Busch: It comes across as having political undertones, like "we have too many laws".

Andreassen: It was meant to be technical, but it's worth more research. That's another goal for this group. As you have questions about what things mean, we can put those out to the rest of the group.

Kohler: Is it appropriate to have the word "empower" in 1.1? Communities are already empowered, we want to assist and enable them.

Andreassen Empower could mean that one group has power and one doesn't; it would be good if we could bypass that in favor of "enabling" or something similar.

Kohler: I'd like to see something about sharing lessons from communities to avoid duplication or replication or reinventing the wheel.

McCammon: When do we get into a knowledge hub. How far down do we go in terms of actions, Nils?

Andreassen: The next step, after reviewing policy statements, goals, and objectives, is to create an action plan for each of them. The team would ideally create a one-pager for each objective.

Denise Michels: When do we look at public comments and put that all together?

Andreassen: Let me follow up with that in an e-mail to the whole group.

Andreassen: I can see that the goals don't always link back to the policy statements, because the goals and objectives came from a lot of different recommendations and then were forced into different buckets. Maybe it doesn't feel holistic now. Do we want to go back and develop goals and objectives based on what's in the policy statement? It would take a lot of reworking, but it might be more appropriate.

Hopkins: Is this what you feel, or is that what's been expressed to you? I think that we've covered a lot. I feel that these four goals fit well into the policy statement.

Andreassen: It was just my sense in reading through it with fresh eyes and responding to some of the group's questions. I don't disagree with the content, but maybe there's an opportunity to combine some of these things. I worry that maybe we're missing something.

McCammon: I'm worried that we have too much. When you say a page of actions for each objective, I start getting nervous that it will again be a laundry list and that not much gets done because of that.

Andreassen: Right. And the implication of having at least a 50-page document at the end of the day. I think there's ways to go back through this and clean it up so that you don't have this laundry list and so it's more straightforward for the outcomes we're trying to achieve.

Michels: I think that for some of these, we don't remember the background and discussion that led us to these goals. That's where the gaps are.

McCammon: I'm wondering if we want a small group of just 2-3 people to work on each goal.

Andreassen: I think so. I think especially for the development of action plans.

McCammon: At least to develop a straw dog of those.

Andreassen: That sounds good to me. A couple people could volunteer for each of these goals, review them, strengthen them relevant to the policy team, review, polish, and edit the objectives and then develop the action plan from there.

McCammon: I think it requires looking at the policy statement and seeing if we can really accomplish them.

Busch: Could you do something where you use the objectives now as a guideline for action items, but then just include the action items in the final product? This feels like a grant proposal.

Kohler: I'm still struggling with the policy statement itself, so I volunteer to wordsmith the statement itself if someone will help me with that.

Joule: I'm just trying to figure out what goal #1 means. What do we mean when we say "empower communities", because in 1.1c it says that the State will increase community capacity to plan. There are some things that are inferred there, at least to me, that I don't think are intended. Do we mean that if communities need money to do this, then the state will give you the money to do that.

Andreassen: I agree. Someone suggested "assist and enable", and I agree, but the implication there is that the state will put forward the resources to accomplish that.

Joule: That's what I'd like it to mean, but I don't think that's what we actually mean.

Andreassen: I think that the plan should explain how we mean to accomplish that. It could mean building out DCRA's program or increasing community response funding.

Busch: Maybe 1.1b is more like a guiding principle. We could have a few of those at the beginning.

Andreassen: Yeah, and I think that there a few others like that where we're saying that something's important, but that's not necessarily the action. Meera offered to help in re-writing policy statement #1.

Michels: I'd like to work with you with goal 1.4, if that's okay.

Kohler: I volunteered to work on the policy statement itself, but I'd be happy to work on goal 1.4 as well.

Busch: I'm interested in 1.2

Hannah: I'm going to sign Mike up to work 1.1.

McCammon: I'd like to look at 1.2 and 1.3 – I think it's possible that those two could merge.

Andreassen: I think you're right. 1.4 seems a little disconnected from the rest of these.

McCammon: Some of the objectives seem more like action items. I think there's a disconnect.

Michels: In 1.4a, we're looking to amend the Stafford Act. I looked at the record – Governor Parnell asked for the exact same thing in 2009.

Andreassen: I know that the Cabinet Climate Team has also looked at this specific action.

Hopkins: I'd like to work with Meera and Denise on that.

Andreassen: We'll sign Chris up for something else.

Hopkins: Is there anyone on 1.3?

Andreassen: Molly suggested combining 1.2 and 1.3

Joule: Luke, I can help you work on 1.1

Andreassen: I have notes. Danielle and I will work on these notes and turn them around.

Hopkins: Are there any public members listening in?

Andreassen: I don't think so. Someone is representing Voice of the Arctic Inupiat, and someone is calling in for Alaska Institute for Justice.

Hopkins: Okay – I know on Wednesday that there are some people who want to listen in on Policy Statement #3.

Busch: Are we really thinking that this is going to be a 55-page document? That seems really long.

Andreassen: What I'm hearing is that there's some consolidation and that some of these don't require a full page. For some of these priority items, we can further develop an action plan with state leads, potential funders, etc.

Andreassen: So we'll clean up the policy statement, and then there are smaller groups that will work on each of the groups to clean up and consolidate. We'll send out notes. Does it seem like meeting again in a couple of weeks makes sense?

Joule: While I'm thinking about policy statement #1, it seems like the data piece doesn't fit in that statement. It's not that you don't want to coordinate data, but maybe it just needs to be worded differently. Maybe this is where Meera and Denise will work on things.

Andreassen: I think that data is weird because really we're talking about research and various forms of knowledge. Maybe instead of data it should be research or something like that.

Kohler: If you go into 4.2, that's more encompassing of data.

Andreassen: I think that we've found is that there's not good data or data infrastructure in place for community risk planning, so the information needed to support community risk planning is deficient. I think that the goal is to improve the knowledge base that communities have to draw from. We'll let you think about that, Meera.

Andreassen: To some experience, 1.2 ties back to the data piece. I think that it's all there – it's just a matter of making it clear and cleaner.

Hannah: Does it make sense to rework the policy statement before working on cleaning up goals and objective?

Andreassen: I'll send out a revised version with notes.

Kohler: I think that just a little bit of wordsmithing will help.

Andreassen: Any other comments?