

State of Alaska Coastal Impact Assistance Program (CIAP)

FINAL PLAN 2008



Table of Contents

Introduction and Background3
 Coastal Impact Assistance Program3
 Eligible Producing States and Coastal Political Subdivisions3
 Coastal Impact Assistance Program Allocations4
Designated State Agency5
Designated Contacts for Coastal Political Subdivisions6
Governor’s Certification of Public Participation7
Coordination with other Federal Resources and Programs7
Plan Implementation Program8
 Introduction to Alaska’s Size and Resources8
 Description of State of Alaska and CPS Goals and Objectives Under CIAP9
 Alaska’s Coastal Zone.....10
 Major Activities to be Funded Under CIAP11
 Description of How the State of Alaska and CPS’s Will Manage, Implement,
 and Monitor CIAP13
 Description of Public Process.....14
 Discussion of Decision-Making Process.....15
 Discussion of CPS Public and Decision Making Process.....16
 Compliance with Federal, State, and Local Laws.....18
 Estimate of Funds to be Spent on Each Authorized Use.....18
Proposed Project Lists19
Proposed Project Descriptions.....21
 State of Alaska Projects21
 Coastal Political Subdivision Projects.....22

Appendices

- Appendix A. Proposed Project Lists for Fiscal Years 2007 – 2010
 - State of Alaska Projects
 - Coastal Political Subdivision Projects
- Appendix B. Proposed Project Descriptions
 - State of Alaska Projects
 - Coastal Political Subdivision Projects
- Appendix C. Governor’s Letter Designating State Agency
- Appendix D. Governor’s Certification of Public Participation
- Appendix E. Summary of Public Comments Received on Draft Plan

Introduction and Background

Coastal Impact Assistance Program

The Energy Policy Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-58) was signed into law by President Bush on August 8, 2005. Section 384 of the Act establishes the Coastal Impact Assistance Program (CIAP) which authorizes funds to be distributed to Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) oil and gas producing states to mitigate the impacts of OCS oil and gas activities.

Under the CIAP, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to distribute to producing states and coastal political subdivisions (CPS's) \$250 million for each of the Federal fiscal years (FY) 2007 through 2010. This money will be shared among Alabama, Alaska, California, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas and will be allocated to each producing state based upon allocation formulas prescribed by the Act. Further, the CIAP allocates money to the eligible CPS's of the states identified above.

Pursuant to the Act, a producing state or CPS shall use all amounts received under this section for one or more of the following five authorized uses:

Authorized Uses:

1. Projects and activities for the conservation, protection, or restoration of coastal areas, including wetland.
2. Mitigation of damage to fish, wildlife, or natural resources.
3. Planning assistance and the administrative costs of complying with CIAP.
4. Implementation of a federally-approved marine, coastal or comprehensive conservation management plan.
5. Mitigation of the impact of OCS activities through funding of onshore infrastructure projects and public service needs.

Eligible Producing States and Coastal Political Subdivisions

A *producing state* is defined in the Act (*Section 31(a)(9)(A) and (B)*) as having a coastal seaward boundary within 200 nautical miles of the geographic center of a leased tract within any area of the OCS. This does not include a state with a majority of its coastline subject to leasing moratoria, unless production was occurring on January 1, 2005, from a lease within 10 nautical miles of the

coastline of that state. States eligible to receive funding are Alabama, Alaska, California, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas.

The Act also specifies eligibility criteria for CPS's (*Section 31(a)(1) and (8)*). A *political subdivision* is defined as "the local political jurisdiction immediately below the level of state government, including counties, parishes, and boroughs." The term *coastal political subdivision* is further defined in the Act as "a political subdivision of a coastal state any part of which political subdivision is (A) within the coastal zone (as defined in Section 304 of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (*16 U.S.C. 1453*)) as of the date of enactment of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 [August 8, 2005]; and (B) not more than 200 nautical miles from the geographic center of any leased tract." Given these criteria, Mineral Management Services (MMS), in consultation with the states, has determined 67 CPS's are eligible to receive CIAP funding nationwide. (MMS CIAP Guidelines)

Coastal Impact Assistance Program Allocations

The MMS shall determine CIAP funding allocations to states and CPS's using the formulas mandated by the Act (*Section 31(b)*). The Act directs that the funds allocated to states and CPS's for FY 2007 and 2008 be determined using qualified OCS revenues received for FY 2006. FY 2009 and 2010 funds shall be determined using the amount of qualified OCS revenues received for FY 2008. (MMS CIAP Guidelines)

The MMS published the allocations for each state and CPS in 2007, for FY 2007 and 2008 distributions. MMS will publish the distributions for FY 2009 and 2010 on or before April 15, 2009. The Act requires a minimum annual allocation of 1 percent to each state. For FY 2007 and 2008 Alaska will receive the minimum 1 percent allocation.

The Act also provides that 35 percent of each state's share shall be distributed directly to its CPS's. Eight coastal political subdivisions in Alaska are eligible to receive funding under CIAP. The allocation to each eligible community is based on the following formula:

- (A) 25% allocated based on the ratio of the CPS's coastal population to the coastal population of all CPS's in the state;
- (B) 25% allocated based on the ratio of the CPS's coastline miles to the coastline miles of all CPS's in the state;
- (C) 50% allocated equally among the two coastal political subdivisions that are closest to the geographic center of a leased tract.

MMS calculated the funding allocation for each CPS. Official allocations were provided to the state and communities on April 16, 2007, and are described below for Alaska.

CIAP Fiscal Year 2007 and 2008 Annual Allocations

Allocation to Alaska	% of Total Allocation	Annual Allocation
Amount Direct to State	65%	\$1,576,250.00
Amount Direct to CPS's	35%	\$848,750.00
Total	100%	\$2,425,000.00

Allocation to Alaska CPS's	% of Total Allocation to CPS's	Annual Allocation
Municipality of Anchorage	16.23%	\$ 137,767.88
Bristol Bay Borough	0.08%	\$ 665.86
Kenai Peninsula Borough	7.00%	\$ 59,435.36
Kodiak Island Borough	8.62%	\$ 73,170.52
Lake & Peninsula Borough	4.07%	\$ 34,518.54
Matanuska-Susitna Borough	3.70%	\$ 31,399.15
North Slope Borough	32.57%	\$ 276,448.76
Northwest Arctic Borough	27.73%	\$ 235,343.93
Total	100.00%	\$ 848,750.00

Designated State Agency

The Alaska Department of Natural Resources (DNR), Division of Coastal and Ocean Management (DCOM) is the designated state agency (See Appendix C for Governor's letter). The contact information is as follows:

Contact: Mr. Randy Bates, Director
DNR, Division of Coastal and Ocean Management
Address: PO Box 111030, Juneau, AK 99811-1030, Mail Stop: 1030/JNU
Phone: (907) 465-8797
Fax: (907) 465-3075
E-mail: randy.bates@alaska.gov

Designated Contacts for Coastal Political Subdivisions

1. Municipality of Anchorage

Contact: Mr. David Wigglesworth, Creeks Community Development
Manager
Address: 632 W. 6th Avenue, Suite 870, P.O. Box 196650
Anchorage, AK 99519-6650
Phone: (907) 343-7116
Fax: (907) 343-4318
E-mail: wigglesworthdt@muni.org

2. Bristol Bay Borough

Contact: Ms. Yvonne Kopy, Planning Specialist
Address: P.O. Box 189, Naknek, AK 99633
Phone: (907) 246-4224
Fax: (907) 246-6633
E-mail: planning@theborough.com

3. Kenai Peninsula Borough

Contact: Mr. Gary Williams, Coastal District Coordinator
Address: 144 N. Binkley, Soldotna, AK 99669
Phone: (907) 714-2216
Fax: (907) 260-5992
E-mail: gwilliams@borough.kenai.ak.us

4. Kodiak Island Borough

Contact: Mr. Charles (Bud) Cassidy, Community Development Department
Director
Address: 710 Mill Bay Road, Kodiak, AK 99615
Phone: (907) 486-9360
Fax: (907) 486-9396
E-mail: bcassidy@kib.co.kodiak.ak.us

5. Lake and Peninsula Borough

Contact: Mr. Marv Smith, Community Development Coordinator
Address: P.O. Box 495, King Salmon, AK 99613
Phone: (907) 246-3421
Fax: (907) 246-6602
E-mail: marvsmith.lpboro@starband.net

6. Matanuska-Susitna Borough

Contact: Ms. Susan Lee, Coastal Coordinator
Address: 350 E. Dahlia Avenue, Palmer, AK 99645-6488
Phone: (907) 745-9862
Fax: (907) 745-9876
E-mail: slee@matsugov.us

7. North Slope Borough

Contact: Ms. Taquilik Hepa, Department of Wildlife Management Director
Address: P.O. Box 69, Barrow, Alaska 99723
Phone: (907) 852-0350
Fax: (907) 852-0351
E-mail: Taquilik.Hepa@north-slope.org

8. Northwest Arctic Borough

Contact: Ms. Annabelle Alvite
Address: P.O. Box 1110, Kotzebue, AK 99752
Phone: (907) 442-2500
Fax: (907) 442-2930

Governor's Certification of Public Participation

The authorizing legislation for CIAP requires the Governor to certify that the public participated and was able to comment on the development of the Coastal Impact Assistance Program plan. A signed document from the Governor is provided in Appendix D certifying that the public was provided ample opportunity to participation in the development of the State of Alaska's Coastal Impact Assistance Program plan.

The public process is described on page 14 of this document.

Coordination with other Federal Resources and Programs

The CIAP legislation requires that the state plan contain "measures for taking into account other relevant Federal resources and programs" (§31(d)(2)(E)).

Several of the projects proposed have multiple components. In many instances CIAP will fund some components while state and other Federal funds will be used for other portions of the project. This information is included in the project descriptions. The state will consider existing Federal resources when implementing the activities proposed in this plan and, to the extent feasible, will coordinate with Federal agencies conducting similar activities.

DCOM sent a letter to Federal agencies (U.S. Department of Interior, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Bureau of Land Management, Minerals Management Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, National Park Service, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Federal Highway Administration, U.S. Coast Guard, U.S. Forest Service, U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Geological Survey, and Federal Aviation Administration) prior to putting the draft plan out for public review. The letter included the draft list of state and CPS projects. The letter encouraged the agencies to consider opportunities to collaborate with the state and the CPS's to create a synergistic relationship between CIAP funded projects and other federally funded projects and to achieve efficient use of resources and funds. The letter requested that comments on such opportunities be made to DCOM during the public review of the Alaska CIAP draft plan and to consider additional opportunities through 2010. DCOM will send the Federal agencies an update of the project schedule annually. DCOM distributed the draft plan to each of the listed Federal agencies at the beginning of the public comment period.

The project descriptions included in Appendix B of this plan include project specific efforts to collaborate with Federal resources and programs.

Plan Implementation Program

Introduction to Alaska's Size and Resources

Alaska is the only arctic state in the nation as well as the largest state, with over 663,000 square miles (land and water combined) and 44,500 linear miles of coastline¹. Alaska amounts to approximately 1/5 of the total United States and has more coastline than all the other U.S. states combined. Alaska is bordered by Canada, to the east, the Gulf of Alaska and the Pacific Ocean to the south, the Bering Sea, Bering Strait, and Chukchi Sea to the west and the Beaufort Sea and the Arctic Ocean to the north²

The state's resources are vast. Alaska holds more than 50 percent of the nation's offshore waters, two-thirds of the nation's coastline, 40 percent of the nation's surface water, and over 50 percent of the nation's wetlands and total fish harvest³. The state has millions of acres of tidelands and submerged lands and is about 45 percent wetland⁴.

¹ The Alaska Coastal Management Program Environmental Impact Statement indicates that Alaska's coastline is 33,000 miles long. However, with advances in mapping technology, DCOM ascertains that the number of coastal miles is approximately 44,500).

² Benson, Carl (1998-09-02). Alaska's Size in Perspective. Geophysical Institute, University of Alaska Fairbanks

³Alaska's Ocean Policy <http://www.adfg.state.ak.us/special/oceans/policy.php>

⁴ Fletcher, K.M., and R. Brownlow. Alaska loses battle for submerged

With a population of 670,053 people⁵, Alaska is the least densely populated state in the nation. Approximately half of the population lives in or around the city of Anchorage. Much of the rest of the population is located in rural coastal communities around the state, few of which are connected by roads. Many communities in northern and western Alaska are isolated. Travel between communities is dependant largely upon air flight, ferry service, or along weather dependant ice roads. Most provisions must be barged in after ice break up at incredible cost. Removal of waste is also by barge and presents a challenge that can often not be met without government assistance. Paying jobs are few and the people of these isolated coastal communities are dependant on the health of the environment to sustain their traditional subsistence lifestyle to feed their families.

Description of State of Alaska and CPS Goals and Objectives Under CIAP

The State of Alaska values the importance of OCS oil and gas development, as well as other resource development, to both the nation and to Alaska. The state understands that resource development comes with certain environmental risks and accepts the responsibility of minimizing environmental impacts. The prevalence of natural hazards in Alaska heightens the environmental risks from resource development. The goal of the Alaska CIAP is to:

- Protect Alaska's coastal areas through wise management of resource development.

Alaska's unique setting, including its size, remoteness and changing climate justify the need for the CIAP projects proposed. While Alaska is dependant on the development of resources through oil and gas exploration, mining, timber harvest and fisheries, the state is also committed to wise management in order to protect environmental resources. Alaska's approach to CIAP is guided by this interest. In support of the CIAP goal, the objectives of the Alaska CIAP are to:

- Conduct projects that will lead to development of effective mitigation strategies and efficient and responsible resource management through, for example:
 - Acquiring baseline data
 - Analyzing cumulative impacts

lands. Mississippi-Alabama Sea Grant Legal Program.
<http://www.olemiss.edu/orgs/SGLC/MS-AL/Water%20Log/dinkum.htm>

⁵ United states Census Bureau, 2006 estimate

- Gathering information useful to determine impacts of mining, oil and gas, and other development
- Mitigating adverse environmental impacts of development
- Training coastal managers
- Minimize impacts of natural hazards on coastal areas through, for example:
 - Restoring coastal areas impacted by natural hazards
 - Mapping and researching natural hazard areas
- Fund projects that address the CIAP goal and meet immediate needs.

Alaska's Coastal Zone

All of the CIAP projects proposed are within the coastal area. The Alaska Coastal Management Program (ACMP), a federally approved and funded program under the Federal Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA), defines "coastal area" as the area within the coastal zone plus Federal lands and waters within the coastal zone boundary and the outer continental shelf off the entire coast of Alaska. (Per Federal regulation, the coastal zone specifically excludes Federal lands). The specific language defining the state's coastal boundary can be found in the ACMP Program Description (http://www.alaskacoast.state.ak.us/Clawhome/handbook/pdf/ACMP_as_amended.pdf).

Alaska's inland coastal area includes areas where the physical and biological processes are a function of direct contact between land and sea, plus areas that are closely affected and influenced by their proximity between land and sea. Generally, this includes areas affected by waves, tides, storm surges, coastal erosion, areas that are likely to be affected by or are vulnerable to sea level rise, critical shoreline habitats, salt marshes, saltwater wetlands, islands, and beaches, wet tundra marshes, and anadromous fish streams. Seaward, the coastal zone extends three miles to the limits of state jurisdiction and includes the outer continental shelf to the 200-mile territorial limit.

The coastal zone in Alaska is the largest in the nation and extends considerably inland in specific locations. For example, in the North Slope Borough, the landward boundary of the coastal zone includes all lands and waters 25 miles from the coast plus a one-mile corridor on either side of anadromous fish streams. This corridor can extend up to 150 miles inland. In the Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta region, the coastal zone extends over 180 miles inland and encompasses the entire 36,000 square mile delta. The inland coastal zone boundary in the Northwest Arctic Borough also extends over 180 miles inland in sections. The entire Lake and Peninsula Borough, at 29,560 square miles, is

included in the coastal zone, except for glaciers, active volcanic peaks, and perennially snow-capped mountains.

An understanding of the extent of Alaska's coastal resources is critical to understanding Alaska's approach to developing, managing and protecting them.

Major Activities to be Funded Under CIAP

Alaska's size, isolation and harsh climate present unique resource management challenges not found in the continental United States. The challenge of managing the state's abundant resources to ensure protection of its coastal areas is further heightened by a lack of baseline data. A comprehensive inventory of Alaska's coastal habitats does not exist. Many of the CIAP projects proposed focus on acquisition of baseline data, mapping of habitats, or mapping of natural hazards. Such projects are necessary for natural resource managers to effectively evaluate the potential environmental affects of development in coastal areas in Alaska. It is imperative that managers know what exists and what impacts have occurred or are likely to occur in order to make sound resource management decisions and develop effective avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures to ensure environmental protection.

The affects of climate warming are felt heavily in Alaska. In September 2007 Governor Palin established the Alaska Climate Change Sub-Cabinet by Executive Order 238 to advise the Office of the Governor on the preparation and implementation of an Alaska Climate Change Strategy. The Executive Order includes the following language:

“Scientific evidence shows many areas of Alaska are experiencing a warming trend. Many experts predict that Alaska, along with our northern latitude neighbors, will continue to warm at a faster pace than any other state, and the warming will continue for decades.”

As a result of climate change, sea ice has been melting at increasing speeds. As noted in the State of Alaska's website regarding Alaska's Climate Change Strategy (<http://www.climatechange.alaska.gov/>) less ice means more open water-which means greater absorption of solar energy-which leads to increased warming in the ocean, and in turn accelerates more ice loss. The Climate Change Strategy indicates that this trend has led to a wide range of impacts in Alaska, including:

- melting glaciers, rising sea levels, and flooding of coastal communities. Warming of oceans and melting of land-based ice increases the volume of ocean water. Loss of sea-ice cover changes habitat for arctic species and leaves coastal communities more exposed to larger waves generated by severe storms.

- thawing permafrost, increased storm severity, and related infrastructure damage to roads, utility infrastructure, pipelines and buildings. Extremes in weather patterns, precipitation and rising sea levels will affect safe water sources in villages, and contributes to increased erosion along Alaska coasts and rivers and undermines Alaska boreal forests.
- loss of the subsistence way of life as animal habitat and migration patterns shift and as hunting and fishing become more dangerous with changing sea and river ice. Warming streams and increased silt from melting glaciers affect fish habitat. Boreal forests advance northward and to higher elevations, displacing tundra. Invasive species compete with native vegetation. Humans, animals and plants may be exposed to new infectious diseases as habitat changes.
- forest fires and insect infestations increasing in frequency and intensity. In the past decade, Alaska has witnessed a record loss of forests to fires and spruce bark beetles.

Several CIAP projects lead to better understanding of the effects of climate change on coastal areas. This information will be useful as state and Federal agencies determine how to best protect the coastal areas from potential impact. For example, the villages of Shishmaref, Kivalina, and Newtok have already begun relocation plans. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has identified over 160 additional rural communities threatened by erosion. By mapping natural hazards and documenting the rate of erosion in an area, resource managers will be able to prioritize the protection of community infrastructure. If not protected from erosion, the risk to the natural environment (from such things as marine debris created from structures eroding into the ocean, or contamination caused by flooding of sewage lagoons and dumpsites, or oil spill) is great.

Unrelated to climate change, several projects proposed by CPS's in northern and western Alaska are intended to increase communities' capacity to manage their infrastructure. Many communities in northern and western Alaska are isolated, have little training resources, and minimal infrastructure. Without proper management the risk of such things as chemical spills and uncontrolled sewage flow from mismanagement or infrastructure failure increases. Many are still on a "honey bucket" system without modern sewage facilities. Harsh weather and great distances between communities increase the cost of doing business in rural Alaska. Waste management for example presents a unique challenge. With no organized trash collection system and often unmaintained or improperly installed dump sites, the risks of environmental impacts increase. While many of the projects proposed have secondary benefits to human health or the economy, the primary focus of the all of the CIAP projects is toward environmental protection.

Several of the projects proposed will assist in the implementation of the Alaska Coastal Management Program and are consistent with CIAP Authorized Use number 4, *Implementation of a federally-approved marine, coastal or comprehensive conservation management plan*. The Federal Coastal Zone Management Act provides the authority by which states can manage their coastal areas. The ACMP is a statewide coastal program that was approved by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). There are 28 active coastal districts within the state. Each district has its own coastal management plan, which once approved by the state and NOAA becomes part of the state program. Among other things, the CZMA establishes that state programs should, in addition to other things, provide for the protection of natural resources, including wetlands, floodplains, estuaries, beaches, dunes, barrier islands, coral reefs, and fish and wildlife and their habitat, within the coastal zone (CZMA, Section 303).

Alaska's CIAP projects are geared toward environmental protection. Each presents a solution to deal with the unique challenges of Alaska, as noted above. All of the state projects address the Alaska CIAP goal (Protect Alaska's coastal areas through wise management of resource development) and at least one of the objectives of the Alaska CIAP as identified on page 9 of this plan.

Projects submitted by the CPS's address community priorities and primarily focus on the protection, restoration, or conservation of coastal areas. CPS projects can generally be categorized as one of the following:

- Removal of marine debris
- Education
- Restoration of habitats
- Mitigation of natural hazards
- Acquisition of baseline data to support effective mitigation and improve resource management
- Mapping of coastal resources

Description of How the State of Alaska and CPS's Will Manage, Implement, and Monitor CIAP

As the designated state agency, DCOM has the authority to manage, implement, and monitor the Alaska CIAP. All state contact with MMS will be through DCOM. The plan includes projects from four State of Alaska agencies (Departments of Fish and Game; Environmental Conservation; Commerce, Community and Economic Development; and Natural Resources). Each agency will manage its own projects. However, DCOM will manage the grants. All grant applications will be submitted to MMS by DCOM, and all CIAP funds will be issued from MMS to DCOM. DCOM will transfer the money to the specific agency that submitted the

project through issuance of a Reimbursable Service Agreement (RSA). Each agency has an established accounting system through which they track project and grant expenditures.

DCOM will monitor state project progress by maintaining regular communication with the project contacts and through biannual project updates. DCOM will provide project contacts with a template for project updates that will focus on achievement of milestones, progress on measurable objectives, unexpected challenges, and expenditures. At a project's conclusion, DCOM will verify and document the successful completion of the measurable outcomes. Should the outcomes not be met, DCOM will work with the project contact to determine the steps and budget necessary to complete the project. Should a state project change courses or fall short of projected outcomes DCOM will work as a liaison between the project agency and MMS in order to keep MMS apprised of project revisions, or to amend the grant as needed.

DCOM worked closely with the CPS's as the CPS's developed their project proposals to ensure they met the MMS Guidelines. The CPS's project proposals are included in the State of Alaska CIAP plan. However, the CPS's will apply for and manage their grants individually. The CPS's will work directly with MMS on approval of the grants and dispersal of the funds. Each CPS will monitor the progress of their individual projects and provide grant reports to MMS. DCOM will request copies of the grant reports from the CPS's. Each CPS has an established accounting system through which they will track project and grant expenditures. The state will assist the CPS's, as needed, to review grant proposals or to assist in discussions with MMS.

DCOM intends to review the CIAP plan annually to evaluate whether or not it still reflects the state's and the CPS's priorities. Should priorities shift, DCOM will revise the State of Alaska CIAP plan. The revised plan will go out for public review and will be submitted to MMS for approval.

Description of Public Process

The general public was provided an opportunity to comment on the CIAP draft plan during a 30 day public comment period, January 13 to February 14, 2008. DCOM posted the draft plan on DCOM's web site (<http://www.dnr.state.ak.us/coastal/>) and hosted a public meeting on the draft plan on January 31, 2008 by teleconference. The comment period and public meeting were noticed as follows:

- Published in the Anchorage Daily News, January 13, 2008
- Published in the Juneau Empire, January 13, 2008
- Posted on the State of Alaska Online Public Notice website, <http://notes5.state.ak.us/pn>, January 11 through February 14, 2008

The draft plan included both the state proposed projects and those from the CPS's. DCOM received nine comments. Three of the comments were in support of specific Tier 1 projects included in the draft CIAP plan. Six comments expressed concern about the limited number of on-the-ground projects and the solicitation of projects from state agencies only. A summary of the comments are included in Appendix E. MMS has estimated that the CIAP allocation for Alaska for 2009 and 2010 will increase significantly due to increased revenue in 2008 from the Chukchi Sea Lease Sale 193. Alaska will need to revise its CIAP plan in 2009 to include additional projects. DCOM will consider the public comments on the draft plan when it establishes a solicitation process for the additional projects. The public will have an opportunity to comment on the revised plan during a 30-day public comment period.

DCOM also received comments from MMS on the draft CIAP plan and on specific project descriptions. The state changed the plan and project descriptions to address MMS's concerns. One of the Tier 2 projects which did receive support from the public (Support for Community Projects that Improve Implementation of the Alaska Coastal Management Program) is not included in the final CIAP plan based on comments from MMS that the project was too vague. Two other Tier 2 projects in the draft plan were dropped because the supporting agency decided not to proceed with the projects through CIAP funding at this time.

In addition to the 30 day public review process, several of the CPS's involved the public by including their assemblies and mayors in the solicitation process. Projects submitted address issues that have been put forward by the public over time as areas of concern. Specific efforts by the CPS's are included in a separate section below.

Discussion of Decision-Making Process

DCOM solicited projects from state resource agencies to include in the CIAP plan for the state's portion of the allocation. Twenty-six projects were submitted from four different agencies equaling approximately twice the four year allocation. DCOM ranked the projects submitted based on the following criteria and provided the Governor's Ocean Policy Subcabinet with a recommendation for Tier 1 and Tier 2 projects.

Ranking Criteria:

- | | |
|--|--------|
| 1. Project meets Alaska CIAP goal and objectives | 45 pts |
| 2. Project addresses immediate concerns | 25 pts |
| 3. Project and deliverables are clearly defined | 20 pts |
| 4. Project is dependant on CIAP funding | 10 pts |

The commissioners for the state resource agencies, or their designees, sit on the Ocean Policy Subcabinet. The Subcabinet reviewed the recommendations and

finalized the ranking for inclusion in the CIAP plan. The Tier 1 projects will use all of the funds available. Tier 2 projects will be funded should a Tier 1 project get cancelled or deferred.

Discussion of CPS Public and Decision Making Process

DCOM initiated contact with the CPS's through the Mayor's Office of each CPS. The CPS's conducted their own internal solicitation of projects and involved several local offices in development of their project lists. Each CPS developed Tier 1 and Tier 2 project lists to address community priorities, which they forwarded to DCOM for inclusion in the state's CIAP plan. DCOM worked with the CPS's to ensure that the proposed projects addressed one of the authorized uses and followed the MMS Guidelines. All of the CPS projects were included in the draft CIAP plan that was released for public comment. In addition to the 30 day public review process, several of the CPS's involved the public by including municipal or borough assemblies and mayors in the solicitation process. The following provides specific examples of the how each CPS involved the public and made their decisions:

Municipality of Anchorage:

The Municipality of Anchorage proposes to use its CIAP funds for a creek restoration project in the Campbell Creek watershed. Anchorage chose this project because it addresses goals and objectives already established in Anchorage's comprehensive plan, which has been endorsed by the Anchorage Planning and Zoning Commission and adopted by the Anchorage Assembly through a public process. The project builds on current Campbell Creek and Little Campbell Creek restoration and education projects. Several other public plans and documents also identify the proposed project as a high priority. For example, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, NOAA and other *Salmon in the City* partners fully support the project. Restoring and sustaining salmon and salmon habitat in the Campbell Creek watershed (and its sub-watersheds) is an Anchorage-area priority for the Alaska Department of Fish and Game Sport Fish Division and the Southeast Sustainable Salmon Fund.

Bristol Bay Borough

The Bristol Bay Borough has decided not to submit any projects at this time to be included in the state CIAP plan. The mayor's office made this decision based on the assessment that the grant application effort would not be worth the \$665.86 annual allocation. Should the amount increase due to changes in CIAP allocations for 2009 and 2010 the borough may reconsider its decision. Any additional projects would require the state to amend the Alaska CIAP Plan and provide a formal 30 day public comment period as required by the CIAP Guidelines.

Kenai Peninsula Borough

The Kenai Peninsula Borough solicited input from communities in the borough, service organizations and state and Federal agencies to develop their project list. The projects nominated were ranked by a selection committee made up of representatives from the borough planning department, the Kenai River Center (a local, state and Federal multi agency facility) and the borough mayor's office. The selection committee forwarded the top projects to the Kenai Peninsula Borough Assembly. The assembly passed a resolution in support of the projects that are included in the state CIAP plan in a public meeting.

Kodiak Island Borough

The Kodiak Island Borough Community Development Department (CDD) staff developed its list of projects based on prior projects that had been initiated and/or vetted by a public process. For example, the mapping project builds on a recently revised coastal management plan, which was the product of many public meetings held by the borough's Planning and Zoning Commission. The two projects related to wetland restoration and education are the result of findings made by an ad hoc All Terrain Vehicle (ATV) Stakeholders Committee, which was appointed by the borough assembly to review ATV and trail use. The borough recently completed a three year pre-hazard mitigation plan process (in conjunction with FEMA and the State of Alaska, Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Management) during which several public meetings were held. The Tier 2 erosion study project would build on this study. The CDD informally consulted with and received input from the Kodiak Island Borough Manager's Office, Planning and Zoning Commission, and Parks and Recreation Committee.

Matanuska –Susitna Borough

The borough selected its two proposed projects based on requests for such information from the public, state and Federal agencies, and a technical science committee. These requests highlighted a gap in data.

Lake and Peninsula Borough

The Lake and Peninsula Borough Planning Department assembled its list of CIAP projects and discussed the projects with the communities in which the projects would occur. The borough worked with the local school district and teachers to develop the erosion tracking project. The Lake and Peninsula Borough Planning Commission passed a motion of support for each of the borough CIAP projects.

North Slope Borough

The North Slope Borough's Department of Wildlife Management (DWM), Planning Department and Mayor's Office worked together to select the borough's CIAP projects. These departments have extensive contact with the public. They based their decision of CIAP projects on their experience and knowledge about current changes along the coast of the Beaufort and Chukchi Seas, about management concerns expressed by the public, and the potential activities planned by oil and gas companies.

Northwest Arctic Borough:

The Northwest Arctic Borough Public Services and Grants, and Community Development Departments initially developed the borough's Tier 1 and Tier 2 proposals. The borough mayor and assembly further prioritized the list to ensure compatibility with the borough's strategic plan and approved the list prior to submitting it to the state. The projects forwarded by the borough address longstanding community issues, such as problems related to water, sewer and solid waste, that are continually listed among annual village top priorities.

Compliance with Federal, State, and Local Laws

For each project, the associated state agency or CPS will be responsible for obtaining all Federal, state and local permits prior to starting the project. Copies of permits will be submitted to DCOM in order for the state to ensure compliance with all relevant laws including the Alaska Coastal Management Program. DCOM or the applicable CPS will submit any necessary permits to MMS with the associated grant applications.

Estimate of Funds to be Spent on Each Authorized Use

The following tables show estimates of the funds by state and CPS that will be spent annually on each authorized use. Only Tier 1 projects are included. For those projects that address more than one authorized use, only the primary authorized use was considered. The five authorized uses are listed on page 3 of this plan.

State Projects: Estimate of funds to be spent on each authorized use

Authorized Use	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	TOTAL
1	\$175,000	\$895,000	\$845,000	\$750,000	\$2,665,000
2	\$0	\$125,000	\$125,000	\$0	\$250,000
3	\$1,250	\$122,914	\$117,800	\$130,050	\$372,014
4	\$1,400,000	\$433,336	\$488,450	\$696,200	\$3,017,986
5	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTAL	\$1,576,250	\$1,576,250	\$1,576,250	\$1,576,250	\$6,305,000

CPS Projects: Estimate of funds to be spent on each authorized use⁶

Authorized Use	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	TOTAL
1	\$247,570	\$413,716	\$479,997	\$447,497	\$1,588,780
2	\$284,216	\$359,216	\$304,216	\$289,216	\$1,236,867
3	\$23,375	\$61,375	\$66,375	\$52,751	\$203,876
4	\$72,800	\$94,671	\$135,671	\$59,671	\$362,812
5	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTAL	\$627,961	\$928,977	\$986,258	\$849,134	\$3,392,332

The CPS's are allocated a combined total of \$3,395,000. The table above estimates spending only \$3,392,332, leaving a discrepancy of \$2,668. Bristol Bay Borough did not submit any project proposals due to the limited allocation provided them (\$665.86 annually). As well, several of the districts rounded their allocation down, leaving a small amount of the funds unaccounted for. Alaska will receive an increased allocation in 2009 and 210 due to an increase in 2008 oil and gas revenue. As a result, Alaska will submit an amended CIAP plan to MMS. The \$2,668 currently not accounted for will be addressed in the amended plan.

Proposed Project Lists

Appendix A includes tables of project lists for both the state projects and the CPS projects. Project funding estimates are provided per allocation year (FY 2007, FY 2008, FY 2009, and FY 2010) and by authorized use. Estimated spending subtotals as a percentage of Federal fiscal year allocation are also provided in order to demonstrate compliance with the 23 percent spending limitation, which

⁶ Due to rounding, the numbers on this table are slightly different than those in Appendix A.

restricts more than 23 percent of the amounts received by a state or CPS for any one fiscal year from being used for Authorized Use #3 and Authorized Use #5.

Appendix A includes the following groups of tables showing CIAP spending and allocations:

- Projects for Fiscal Years 2007 – 2010 Proposed by State of Alaska
 - Tier 1 projects
 - Tier 2 projects
- Projects for Fiscal Years 2007 – 2010 Proposed by Coastal Political Subdivisions
 - All CPS's combined (except for Bristol Bay Borough which did not submit any projects)
 - Municipality of Anchorage
 - Kenai Peninsula Borough
 - Kodiak Island Borough
 - Lake and Peninsula Borough
 - Matanuska-Susitna Borough
 - North Slope Borough
 - Northwest Arctic Borough

In addition to the tables in Appendix A, each project description (Appendix B) includes a Spending Estimate table. This table indicates how much money will be spent each year of the project, unrelated to fiscal or calendar year. In some instances, project initiation will depend on when funding becomes available and on seasonal limitations. All Tier 1 project descriptions also include a Funding per Allocation Year of CIAP table. This table indicates which Federal fiscal year allocation the funding will be drawn from and is consistent with the tables in Appendix A.

Proposed Project Descriptions

Appendix B includes descriptions for the following State of Alaska and CPS projects.

State of Alaska Projects

Tier 1 Projects

- 1 Stikine River Mining Activity Risk Assessment
- 2 ShoreZone Mapping
- 3 Fish Monitoring Program
- 4 Current Measurements in Potential Oil Exploration and/or Development Areas of the Landfast Ice Zone of the Alaskan Beaufort Sea
- 5 Matanuska-Susitna Trail Rehabilitation and Wetland Restoration
- 6 Mertarvik Waterfront Management and All Hazards Plan
- 7 Newtok Environmental Site Inventory and Assessment
- 8 Division of Coastal and Ocean Management - Administrative Costs
- 9 Coastal Processes Seminars
- 10 Geohazards Evaluation and Geologic Mapping for Coastal Communities
- 11 Alaska Monitoring and Assessment Program (AKMAP) - Chukchi Sea Coastal Survey
- 12 Monitoring Steller Sea Lions at Remote Sites in the Bering Sea
- 13 Hydro-acoustic Monitoring of Ambient Noise and Marine Mammals in the Chukchi Sea

Tier 2 Projects

1. Geographic Response Strategies (GRS)
2. Potential Places of Refuge Project (PPOR)
3. Emergency Towing Systems (ETS) for Alaska
4. Coastal Community Spill Response Capability Enhancement
5. Alaska Monitoring and Assessment Program (AKMAP) Alaska Bering Sea Coastal Survey
6. Mercury Deposition Monitoring in Coastal Alaska
7. Knik River Public Use Area Erosion Control
8. Kachemak Bay Drainage Basin Sustainable Access Routes Reservation and Improvement
9. Alaska Coastal Management Program Implementation Workshops
10. Marine Debris Clean-up

Coastal Political Subdivision Projects

Municipality of Anchorage – Tier 1

1. Anchorage Creeks CIAP Restoration Project

Kenai Peninsula Borough – Tier 1

1. Crooked Creek Bank Restoration and Habitat Protection
2. Kasilof Personal Use Fisheries Habitat Protection
3. Crooked Creek State Recreational Area River Bank Restoration
4. CIAP Planning and Administration

Kodiak Island Borough – Tier 1

1. Metal Debris Clean Up and Removal
2. Trail Hardening or Relocation to Enhance and Improve Coastal Water Quality and Stream Habitat
3. Public Education on the Value of Conserving Wetlands and Other Coastal Habitats
4. Mapping of Coastal and Marine Resources

Kodiak Island Borough – Tier 2

1. Coastal Erosion Study

Lake and Peninsula Borough – Tier 1

1. Lake and Peninsula Borough Beach Erosion Tracking Program and Community Profile Map Additions and Updates
2. Lake and Peninsula Borough Mapping Update for the Protection of Critical Coastal Resources and Identification of Land Status
3. Lake and Peninsula Borough Coastal Management Plan Amendment – Community Outreach Component

Matanuska-Susitna Borough – Tier 1

1. *“Protect the Edge: Where the Water Meets the Land”* a Full-color 40-60 Page Publication About Protecting Riparian Habitat and Wetlands
2. Ortho-rectified Imagery of the Matanuska-Susitna Coastal Zone

North Slope Borough – Tier 1

1. Restoration and Rehabilitation of Coastal Areas Through the Installation of Hardened Trail

2. Assessment of the Biotic and Abiotic Factors Influencing the Ikpikpuk River Delta, which is Needed for Predicting Changes and Developing Plans to Conserve and Protect the Delta
3. Assessment of the Health and Biology of Arctic Marine Mammals for the Development and Evaluation of Mitigation Measures to Reduce Impacts from a Changing Arctic Environment
4. Assessment of the Vulnerability of Archaeological and Cultural Sites to Coastal Erosion and the Development of Plans to Protect the Sites
5. Implementation and Enhancement of Permitting Activities of the North Slope Borough

Northwest Arctic Borough – Tier 1

1. Protecting Coastal Areas through Region-wide Waste Management Improvement
2. Protecting Coastal Areas through Planning and Guidance for Sustainable Tourism
3. Improving Management Capacity to Protect Coastal Areas
4. Protection of Coastal Areas from Marine Debris
5. Administrative Costs
6. Improving Subsistence Information to Implement Federal Plans
7. Improving Public Involvement for Implementation of Federally Approved Plans

Northwest Arctic Borough – Tier 2

1. Village-based Environmental Monitoring to Protect Coastal Areas