

**CALT Participants:** Meera Kohler, Nicole Kanayurak, Luke Hopkins, Lisa Busch, Lorali Simon, Mike Levine, Chris Rose, Linda Behnken, Molly McCammon, Isaac Vanderberg

**State Participants:** Denise Koch, Alice Edwards, Alida Bus, Larry Hartig, David Rogers

**Nils Andreassen:** Wanted to touch base. Everyone's had the chance to review new drafts. Any initial feedback on draft policy? Is everyone comfortable with where we're at with the format? Objectives have been moved over to action plan to start a separate process there. Is anything missing from the policy statements?

Linda Behnken: One of the comments we heard during the Sitka listening session is that there wasn't much in the policy for regulatory change. I haven't had time to go through the policy thoroughly, but I wondered whether that's something that's come through to you.

Nils: What would that look like?

Behnken: It'd be along the lines of saying that we're setting these goals. We have placeholders for when greenhouse gases would be reduced. It would be more concrete steps like that to achieve a specific objective.

Nils: So action items should include suggested regulatory aspects to it?

Behnken: Yes, action forcing.

Nils: If you're comfortable with this policy, we'll still accept edits. The Cabinet Climate Team is looking through it as well. From my point of view, the climate policy is comprehensive and responds to a lot of the comments that we've heard. I think that the slimmed-down version meets the interests that you've expressed for a streamlined approach that's clear. We can build out public comments in the action items. The action plan already feels extensive. The actions themselves were formerly objectives – it seemed like that made sense. A lot of the objectives felt like actions anyways.

As part of implementation, we've asked to identify lead state agencies and potential partners. Doesn't have to be an exhaustive list. Also need an approach to milestones for each action item so that we know that the state's making plans. Actions to help move the recommendations forward. We can think about what research gaps exist. That might be something we ask of the science advisory panel. If there's funding necessary for that action, where does that come from?

Chris Rose: Anything other than milestones, research, funding?

Nils: We anticipate that if some recommendation is going to have a negative impact on a sector or part of the state, we should acknowledge that and discuss how to mitigate. One impact will be that it will cost money – need to think about scalability and how to draw in other investments. Other questions?

Luke Hopkins: Thinking about recent comments about coal industry and mention of carbon sequestration.

Nils: For coal example, knowing that there's an active coal mine, including industry and employment that counts on that activity. Need to not put Alaskans out of work while still reducing carbon footprint. That will be where it's most challenging on mitigation side. Most challenging part of adaptation is finding funding: leveraging partnerships, identifying outside funding, finding efficiencies.

Meera Kohler: Sounds like you're asking the team to develop action templates for each item. Short timeline. Do you want to have volunteers or delegate them?

Nils: We do have a pretty aggressive timeline. Each of you are working on different policy statements. I can update those. Need to revise teams since we've added education. I can send that around. What I'd like is that within each team, I can send out an email to each group and each team can volunteer or otherwise ask to be involved in different action items. Can divvy that up between one or two or three people to draft something that can be shared with the team. I don't think that me assigning action items is helpful. I can send stuff out today and get that going today. In terms of timeline, we wanted you to be working on that over the course of the next week. If you could be working on that over the next two weeks, I think that would be helpful. By the week of the 25<sup>th</sup>, we'd really like to have some of that coalesced and have some of those action items back to us. Within each team, we'd have a draft that the team could review. Ideally by the end of the week of the 25<sup>th</sup> we could have quick calls to review drafts within teams. We'll have revised versions and an almost complete draft ready for the call on July 10<sup>th</sup>. We'll have something there for you to review and provide feedback on.

Kohler: I'm looking at timeline you sent out. Doesn't show CALT meeting on July 10<sup>th</sup>.

Nils: Sorry, we added July 10<sup>th</sup> CALT meeting after that was sent out. That's what we're aiming at. We want to give ourselves enough time between the 10<sup>th</sup> and the 17<sup>th</sup> to produce a full draft of everything and to give you enough time to review prior to the August 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting.

Rose: What I might do is send you my ideas for implementation and action on these different objectives from various policy statements and then, at some point, I'm wondering if you'll put those suggestions in and there will be an opportunity for us to provide feedback. I don't think it's realistic for me to be on several policy statement calls in the next 10 days. I'll send you a bunch of different things.

Kohler: I'm in the same boat. I won't be able to make calls, but certainly able to participate.

Lisa Busch: I like that idea.

Rose: Do you want to set a time for a meeting on July 2<sup>nd</sup>, like 9am?

Nils: That works for me.

Kohler: Prefer 10am.

Nils: Any objections to 10am on July 2<sup>nd</sup>?

Hopkins: What time is the July 10<sup>th</sup> meeting?

Nils: 9-11.

Molly McCammon: I'll be traveling most of this time, but I can provide input.

Mike LeVine: Me too.

Isaac Vanderberg: Plan looks good to me.

Nils: I'll follow up and then we can move forward. I ask that each of you add to the action plan as much as you can. Think about Linda's comment re: regulatory change. If there's anything that's missing, let us know. One comment I've heard is that we don't have enough about fisheries or ocean acidification. Whoever's working on education policy, that still need a lot of input. I'll provide some instructions or further input coming out of this meeting, but thank you for your time.

LeVine: To add to that, I heard a bunch about missing the fisheries and ocean acidification piece at the listening session in Kodiak.

Nils: Between policy statements 2 and 3, I think there's room to include fisheries, ocean acidification and mariculture issues. For those who had a chance to read through the public comments, there's a lot to go through there. The Alaska Institute for Justice has lengthy comments, as well as some other groups. If you have thoughts from public comments, you can send me notes based on that.

Hopkins: Some people are asking "what are the public comments?". I think we heard that the public can't see that online at this time.

Nils: We are figuring out the process for that since this is a different kind of relationship.

McCammon: I think we also should be clear about how we're using the comments.

Nils: Right. Based on the public comment, it informed our approach to this new draft, but we didn't take any single public comment and turn it into a change within the current version. But there's a lot that we changed based on what's there, and stuff that you had already changed based on policy team work. Any other questions for the good of the order? I'll revise timeline and policy team stuff and give you some more clarity about calls.

Hopkins: I've also been asked to what extent the Lt. Governor's looked at this and given approval to you and Nikoosh.

Nils: We've talked to the Lt. Governor. Clear that we want this to be ambitious and bold but that we also want it to be practical. Talked about already starting to prepare short-term actions. He's looking at what the State can do very quickly after the recommendations come out.

Hopkins: Is there an opportunity for us to listen to the O&G team?

Nils: I think that the group has decided how they're going to approach this, which is to update the 2009 Mitigation Advisory Group report. We've asked them to review this policy and comment on what's already in here. I'm expecting a report from them (white paper) by July 2<sup>nd</sup>. I don't know if they're meeting again or if they're just doing this internally.

Hopkins: When I listened in, I recalled that they were going to send things back through AOGA. AOGA had a long piece in the public comment.

Behnken: If people do come across any comments that are really helpful with ocean acidification and fisheries focus, I would love if you could highlight them for me to make sure that I don't miss any of those.

McCammon: I'll work on that with our OA network too.

Nils: Sounds good. I'll follow up to this call with e-mailed instructions and you can all get moving on adding stuff to the action items that you feel comfortable on.