

Annual General Meeting 11-9-11

Day 1

Attendees:

Karen Kelly, NAEC
Peg Tileston, Alliance
Trish Rolfe, Trustees
Nelson Page, Alliance
Pete Dronkers, NAEC
Mark Masteller, Cascadia Green Building Council
Lois Epstein, The Wilderness Society
Jed Smith, SAF
Doug Tosa, ACE
Louisa Yanes, ACE
Mike Coumbe, Alliance
Polly Carr, ACF
Nick Moe, ACE
Lissa Hughes, NAEC
Jessie Petersen, NAEC
Megan McBride, AYE
Claire Berezowitz, AYE
Shawna Larson, Pacific Environment
Colleen Keane, Pacific Environment
Keiki Kehoe, Brainerd
Casey Anderson, AMC
Samantha Englishoe, ACAT
Andy Moderow, Alliance
Dave Theriault, Alliance
Betty Jo Pritchett, Alliance
Sonya Wellman, Alliance
Kate McKeown, Alliance
Dan Lesh, SEACC
Daven Hafey, SEACC
Jon Miller, NAEC
Sue Libenson, ACE
Steve Cleary, AkPIRG
Wade Willis, Science Now Project
Emily Fehrenbacher, Sierra Club
David Rogers, Alliance and Voters lobbyist
Lindsey Hadjuk, Sierra Club
Ryan S. - AEF
Victoria Clark- Trustees
Jamie Kenworthy, Voters
Martha Levensaler, LCV
Jessica Cler, ACE

Carly Weir, AEF
Nancy Bale, DCC
Heidi Zimmer, ACAT
Pat Lavin, NWF

9:30am- **Meeting opens.** Andy Moderow gives opening remarks. Review of the agenda

9:40am- **Meet the members speed dating**

10am- Steve Cleary, Kate McKeown, and Dan Lesh talk about **successes for the conservation community.** Steve spoke about wins during the CEA utility elections. Kate spoke about success during the Fire Island Wind campaign. Powerpoint slides are available for the presentations by Kate and Dan. Email bettyjo@akvoice.org to request a copy of the slides

10:45am- **Parnell's legal war on the environment, Victoria Clark-Vicky** from Trustees spoke about Parnell's legal war on the environment.

11:40am- **Nelson Page talks about 'business' at the Alaska Conservation Alliance**

There have been many transitions. Mike Coumbe was interim director for a few months. The new Executive Director is Andy Moderow. The purpose of the Alliance is to provide an opportunity for member groups to come together and to provide a way for us all to communicate. We work hard to make sure that the issues that are important to you are actually getting traction. There are over 30 dues paying member groups now. That is less than a third of the conservation groups that are in Alaska working on statewide issues (not including the national groups). We hope to be the 'fist' and hope that you feel that way too. At any time you should feel free to tell us how you think we should improve what we do. We had successes this last legislative session, notably energy efficiency.

1:00pm Jeff Ottesen talked about **Alaska's Department of Transportation-** Powerpoint slides are available. Please email bettyjo@akvoice.org to request a copy

2:00pm **Priority Proposal Presentations**

Samantha from ACAT presented on the **PBDE Priority**

See 'Protecting Environmental Health and Preventing Toxic Exposures' common agenda priority proposal for more details

Questions:

Peg: Has any organized dissent surfaced? *Samantha:* Yes. Well funded group, Citizens for Fire Safety, is an industry group.

Wade: Appears you have broad support and success in the legislature to day, how would the Alliance's support help you? *Samantha:* ACAT is very small. When things are timely it's better to use everyone's networks. *Dave:* We provide many things that are necessary in the legislature. Community organizing support that groups need. Legislative luncheons, etc. *Samantha:* Dave is

in Juneau and can do more than we can from Anchorage. *Dave*: We also have a professional lobbyist and that is something that other member groups don't have.

Dave: Can you describe the tone and tenor in legislative meetings? What kind of questions they were asking? Issues being raised? *Samantha*: There was confusion about what EPA actually does. They assume that products are already safe. We created a document with some of the reoccurring questions but it depends on the committees. House Labor and Commerce was very difficult. In Senate Finance, Stedman doesn't have a problem with the bill. If we can get more support earlier on, we have a better chance.

Karen: Urgency. To the extent that you are able to predict, if this doesn't pass, what can we do to set this up for the future. *Samantha*: Even if it does pass there is still administrative issues, etc. We've built increased awareness in the legislature. We have a large base now and we can switch to different toxics. It's important to do now because we have made it further than we have before.

Pete: What are the hurdles for getting this done on a national level? *Samantha*: It's not a priority. The toxic control act of 1977 is a joke. There is no authority given to the EPA. States are doing it. The EU has banned it. It's not a high priority. Sen. Begich sponsored the Safe Chemicals Act of 2011 so he knows that it's important.

Sue: Where are the retailers? Do local retailers support? *Samantha*: Some already have PBDE free products. Manufacturers don't have to provide that information. We are going to have to work on it locally. Several companies are already using PBDE free products- Apple, etc

Sue: Retailers in support? *Samantha*: I'm going to try to get the Mattress Ranch guy to come out in support. We don't want to hurt retailers. This is really about the manufacturers that provide the products.

Clean Energy Proposal

Dan Lesh and Jessie Petersen

For more information, please refer to 'Clean Energy Priority Proposal' document

Questions:

David Rogers: Legislation or an appropriation? *Dan*: There is no specific legislation that has risen to the top yet. The creation of independent energy efficiency utility maybe? *Jessie*: Much of this was from feedback that we have received on the appliance change out program. We wanted to push and make it bigger, maybe a pilot program. That can be funded through a capital appropriation. It would take significant marketing on our end. There are some opportunities in the Southeast IRP on pushing recommendations.

Sue: Is this more of an appropriations ask? *Dan*: Yes *Sue*: It would be a good idea for us to do something with energy. My main concern is that there is no southcentral component. More than half of the legislature is from the Southcentral or the Bush. *Dan*: We haven't had that discussion yet. We would want that. *Jessie*: It would take a SAF organizer reaching out to the legislator. We just gave two tangible examples that we had in mind. *Dan*: There is no doubt that this is a statewide priority. Whether or not there is a southcentral component is a question.

Mark: I think it would be easy to do a Southcentral component. HB306 and SB220 don't have implementation programs so this would be pushing us down the road.

Pete: Efficiency and conservation are different. Sometimes conservation should be part of the equation. *Dan*: Yes they are both included.

Transportation priority presented by Lissa Hughes, Daven from SEACC, Lindsey from Sierra Club and Pete Dronkers from NAEC. Powerpoint slides available. Email bettyjo@akvoice.org to request a copy of the slides.

Questions held until tomorrow due to time constraints.

Resident's First Priority Proposal presented by Wade. See 'Resident's First' Priority Proposal for more details.

Questions held until tomorrow due to time constraints.

3:15pm Priority Proposal Analysis

Q: What do you expect the major issues/topics will be this session?

Senator Hollis French (French):

- What is not passed will die at the end of the 90 day session.
- Majority of the time will be taken up by oil/gas taxes.
- House and Senate are strained, primarily because of Coastal Management Zone.
- The upcoming election may mean that the Alaska Senate Majority Bipartisan Working Group is coming to an end.
- Make priorities small and achievable, grand proposals will not walk through the legislatures.

David Rogers, Lobbyist, Alaska Conservation Alliance and Voters (Rogers):

- It's a two year cycle, there is not much time.

French:

- Nothing will happen with Coastal Management Zone, people will sit back and see if the initiative will pass by itself. Then you have the mega projects, what takes precedent and what is the best way forward to power Southcentral? Is it a big gasline, a bullet line or Susitna dam?

Kevin Harun, Legislative Aide, Rep. Berta Gardner (Harun):

- Own opinions expressed. We want to build power besides just winning, also want to hold people accountable. House will not go for environmental issues- any.
- The Toxics priority is too complicated.
- What about our Governor? The public is not paying attention to what the Governor and Mayor are doing. The Governor is very dangerous.
- The Energy and Transportation priorities have the potential to win.
- We need to hold Governor accountable.
- On Road to Resources (R2R), I agree with all threats, but the proposal seems more of a threat. The dedicated fund is scary. How does the fund not fund R2R? Why not look at an operations and maintenance fund, rather than transportation fund? We should fix what we already have.

French:

- There is strong funding for renewable energy (RE) and energy efficiency (EE) programs that are already out there (REGF, AHFC, EEGF, etc.) It's a bipartisan issue.

Rogers:

- You can ask for an appropriation for RE and EE, it's doable. If you have a good case for new projects or programs you will be heard.

Harun:

- Energy issues are bipartisan. The elephant in the room is the Governor, how do we hold him accountable?

Rogers:

- One of the priorities is done (EE), Coastal Management has holes in it, and the toxics priority is up for re-vote. We should have an obligation to the toxics priority.
- HB30 is good bill, but there is a risk. We can get it to the Senate Finance Committee. The R2R is really two proposals. The fund and then R2R. One is capital budget, one is a statutory play. In thinking of changing priorities, R2R is a huge one. We do need to figure out a strategy for R2R. Even if it's not a priority we will probably address it. The problems will not go away.
- In the Clean Energy priority, the pilot project is okay. If utilities are supported then it will be easier to sell. We need to gather a large consensus for the projects. Utilities can be tough customers.

French:

- The big projects will start to be debated in the capital budget. We don't want to get half way through two projects and realize one is a big mistake. We have enough money to do both, but we might not need both, and probably don't.
- Toxic Priority- we might be able to achieve it.
- Clean Energy Priority- Might not like it because of the title only
- Transportation Priority- this is a huge priority
- Wildlife- God bless Wade!

Harun:

- Transportation and Energy might pass in House, but the PBDE might not pass, wildlife has "greenie" written on it. Should our focus be to pass legislation? We need to look long term. Legislation should be a vehicle to shift focus to hold the Governor accountable. We need to pick issues that become public issues and we can take on the Governor.

Martha:

- Mike, do you have insights on PDBE?

Mike (Alliance):

- It will have to make it through the house. The house is the sticking point. Currently two people are sitting on it in the house. We need to know how to get pass those two individuals. You have to target them, and then get the bill passed them. And along the way ask if the bill that does get pass them is good enough.

French:

- An 'adjournment package' might contain something with Coastal Management

Pat (NWF):

- What is your sense to legislative commitment to big gas project solutions?

French:

- The fact that there is gas in Cook Inlet undermines the bigger projects down the road.

Dan (SEACC):

- Have you been following the transportation fund? Will it pass with or without us?

French:

- I see the fund as problematic. I think you should push one or two transportation projects rather than a fund, because you don't know where that money will go to.

Peg (Alliance and Voters):

- Will the senate hold firm on oil and gas tax?

French:

- I'll be a tough sell. Every day there is more good news coming on oil production. Norway doesn't understand the idea of the gas tax. We need to stand on our own two feet. Get involved in elections- one seat makes a big difference.

Harun:

- I think an environmental group should come out and support the oil and gas tax. Then it might stop.

Lois:

- The transportation fund will allow us to use our own money, not federal money. I think there are some details to be worth looking at.

Wade:

- The public does care about a lot of things, we are asking for accountability with our wildlife priority. We need to destroy the PR game that they are playing; we are trying to hold the Governor accountable.

Rogers:

- I'm not sure next session is the time for the wildlife priority.
- PBDE is a priority; we don't have a great shot though. But I would hate to give up on a priority.
- Energy is our baby, this is us.

Harun:

- People do care about things, but people aren't aware of things. We care, that's why we are here. How do we rally people and build a base? Besides conservationists, how do we get people involved, outside our circle?

French:

- I'll be defending ACES. Thank you for having me!

4pm- Susitna-Watana: The Path Forward

Powerpoint slides are available for this presentation, please email bettyjo@akvoice.org to request a copy

Day 2

Attendees:

Nick Moe, ACE

Louisa Yanes, ACE

Doug Tosa, ACE
Martha Levensaler, LCV
Jessica Cler, ACE
Karen Kelly, NAEC
Lissa Hughes, NAEC
Jon Miller, NAEC
Polly Carr, ACF
Keiki Kehoe, Brainerd
Casey Anderson, AMC
Megan McBride, AYE
Jessie Petersen, NAEC
Pete Dronkers, NAEC
Rachel Dunkerslout, AMCC
Nelson Page, Alliance
Andy Moderow, Alliance
Daven Hafey, SEACC
Dan Lesh, SEACC
Dave Theriault, Alliance
Mike Coumbe, Alliance
Mark Masteller, Cascadia
Jed Smith, SAF
Sue Libenson, ACE
Colleen Keane, Pacific Environment
Lindsey Hajduk, Sierra Club
David Rogers, Voters
Peg Tileston, Voters/Alliance
Lois Epstein, TWS
Trish Rolfe, Trustees
Heidi Zimmer, ACAT
Gilbert Matcore, Pacific Environment
Nancy Bale, DCC
Jan Snyder, ACF

9:30am Meeting Opens

9:45am Creating Collective Conservation Impact: The transformers Project- Polly Carr, Martha Levensaler, Andy Moderow

Powerpoint presentation is available. Email bettyjo@akvoice.org to request a copy.

Presentation Highlights:

Polly- we brought EDs together back in the fall of 2009 to look at out of the box efforts to use resources more efficiently.

There are 132 conservation groups across the state- 53 in Anchorage. There are an average of eight issues per organization. The aggregate conservation budget is 20 million. 62% is salaries, administration and insurance.

We looked at the data and had some deep conversation to develop challenges that we face:

- We don't have common binding long term vision. We tend to do things annually.
- We are marginalized. Our people and our issues and messages are not resonating with the rest of the state. We are seen as project stoppers and we need to be problem solvers
- We are not inclusive when we are out of this room. How diverse is this room? How are we connecting with communities and listening to their issues?
- We are inefficient, overall sense. There are some redundancies of efforts and some gaps that we could be better at.
- This all led to a lack of power
- We think it's an opportunity to re-think this.

Solution: We think we need a new model. This is a paradigm shift. Two tracks- one would be functions. Strategic planning, communications, development, community organizing are the functions. The second track is an alternative community structure- could we explore some restructuring of programs- HR, funding, etc.

Andy talks about the **first track, collaboration on functions and strategic planning.**

Martha Levensaler talks about **re-structuring**. We've worked on what the structure will look like and also what the fears are.

Polly talks about the **timeline**: We are exploring two tracks simultaneously. Strategic planning process will start in January and then we hope to wrap up in July and implement in Fall/winter. On the restructuring we are hoping to decide early 2012 if we need to move forward if changes need to be met.

11:15am Coastal Management Ballot Initiative Presentation- Bruce Botelho

Bruce Botelho spoke about his ballot initiative and what kind of support it needs.

Questions:

Mike- There are five weeks to get the signatures during the worst, darkest month of the year. I think the chances are slim. What do you think this will do if you don't make it? *Bruce*- I'm planning on being successful. I'm counting on the governor and legislators that oppose this thinking that it can't be done. They are quiet. I want to get 50,000 signatures. I don't think Alaskans feel that they've been dealt fairly with this.

Jon: Will there be much publicity? *Bruce*: We can't afford it. We are going door-to-door, having private parties. We are counting on supporters local connections.

Sonya: What do you have planned for social media? *Bruce*: We have facebook, possibly twitter. Our website is www.alaskacoastalmanagement.org. You can volunteer from this website. You can really help us by using your own networks to get volunteers and signatures.

Dan: Can you talk more about the nature of the program that you are proposing? Does it start off where the legislature ended? *Bruce*: DEC carve-out is gone. We shifted the administration from DNR to Department of Commerce. We expect the council itself to develop regulations for some things.

Lois- What is your thinking about doing a soft coastal zone program vs. a stronger one? Instead of something more like the pre-Murkowski era program which was one of the best? *Bruce-* The elements of the pre-2003 plan are in place. Except for two areas- there is no express citizen lawsuit provision but there is language that provides for it. The explicit appeal process is not there also and we are silent on that. We think the board would provide regulations about this. We will have a comparison up on our site soon that compares element by element the pre-2003 program, our program and the senate bill from last year.

Lois: The North Slope Borough, where do they stand on this? *Bruce:* They support it.

1pm IPC Meeting

Trish Rolfe called the meeting to order 1:13pm

14 member groups- quorum achieved

Alaska Center for the Environment
Cascadia Green Building Council
Alaska Mobility Coalition
Friends of Mat-Su
National Wildlife Foundation
Sierra Club
SEACC
Trustees
The Wilderness Society
Alaska Conservation Alliance
Alaska Conservation Voters
Denali Citizens Council
Alaska Community Action on Toxics
Northern Alaska Environmental Center

Dave: Susitna. We need to talk about our Policy Statement draft. This is internal only. For more details please read the draft document.

Questions:

David- Someone will ask what the viable alternatives are so we should know what those are?

Dave: They are working on a report right now to show alternatives. It should be published by session.

Dan- third paragraph – “this process is usually reserved for relicensing...” ‘should say “typically....and some other edits.”

No one objects.

Dan- 4th paragraph “Susitna offers no measurable...” doesn’t immediately make sense. Maybe skip that because you say later ‘what little benefit...’

Louisa- Jan edited this and he has a much more nuanced understanding of it.

Pat- I don’t understand the energy security reference. *Mark-* One big single project with a small transmission line does not improve energy security. Little projects are better.

Dan- The statement could be characterized as out of touch. *Trish-* For Fairbanks it would be less expensive. Fairbanks people are feeling like there are no options. *Lissa-* This conversation has to go further. This project does not heat a house and that is a lot bigger issue for Fairbanks. That

language needs to be stronger. Last paragraph ‘the project does not resolve the....’ The statement should be broader to include the rest of the state.

Mark- 4th sentence 1st paragraph – The sentence starts “This project....”. I think it should read after the comma “which does not include necessary transmission line upgrades.” We should never refer to this as a renewable energy project.

Dave- Do we want to clarify that Susitna doesn’t address home heating?

Everyone- Yes

Trish- I think we should clarify that most Alaskans get heat from gas, not electricity.

Mark- In Canada, when they do all the conservation/efficiency measures, it makes sense to heat with electricity but we don’t need to address that here.

Sue- If we see smaller projects in the report then we might end up with more jobs, more diverse around the state, in terms of construction, etc. We could add the jobs argument in there. Maybe in the end. Widespread, diverse projects would mean widespread, diverse jobs.

Pat- This is internal, not messaging.

Dave- This is going to guide my messaging for the capitol building. It might be worth doing word-smithing in case we want to go public with it in the future.

No objections to Sue’s jobs addition.

Pete- I think it’s dangerous to say that this project isn’t renewable project, all projects have a shelf life. I think we should call it renewable.

Mark- I think we should say it isn’t. There are too many environmental impacts. Small hydro I think should be renewable but not large hydro.

Dave- We refer to hydro as non-fossil fuel energy supply.

Pete- I think we should change the word to electricity. At the end of the first page we should supplement ‘energy supplies’ with electrical.

Karen- This was more robust than what we had last year. Whether internal or external, I see this as a serious piece of information. The 3rd paragraph is about the FERC process. But it is just observations, not an actual opinion. I think we need to say ‘we need to see x happen before we can support Susitna’. How are you going to use this?

Dave- Louisa drafted this as a resolution. The message that will be better received is the robust set of alternatives. That is what I need. Many of these can’t be acted on. This document is what I need but the question is whether it gives you what you need. Should we have more action items?

Karen- I feel like we need the ‘therefore’.

Nelson- Are we at the point where we are going to oppose it?

Dave- No.

Nelson- I read this document as opposition. If you think this won’t be external you won’t succeed in that. I read this document as us coming out against Susitna.

Pete- We can change the perception by being a little more firm about the alternatives. This doesn’t talk about coal combustion. Everyone in this room would agree that support of this would reduce greenhouse gas emissions. I think if we said ‘if this achieves a major reduction of greenhouse gases in AK then we could support this project’. We aren’t making that point clear in this document.

Pat- These last two go to a more public position. These are totally different as to what we are doing. We want an internal document, not a public position.

Nick: This one isn’t that assertive.

Pat: This document gives Dave some direction about what to talk about in Juneau.

Nelson: Part of what Dave should say is ‘we haven’t taken a position’.

Dave: We need to have the alternatives before the session. I understand that we need specific alternative ideas as to what the \$2b will pay for.

Mark: Part of the discussion is that if we go down this road, we will be putting all the eggs in one basket. What we want is energy efficiency, conservation and renewable projects for far less money.

Polly: I’m unclear of whether the membership wants no position or to oppose it.

Nelson: We have concerns but can’t oppose it until we have good alternatives.

Jon: Northern center’s board has taken an interim position that we currently oppose Susitna but are firmly supporting energy efficiency and renewable projects. We are opposed now but don’t have to always.

Lissa: I think we should wait until the gap data is available about the environmental impacts.

Trish: We felt like at this point in the process if we oppose the project as a starting point they will shut us out of the talks. There is a long process and we need to make sure our concerns are heard. Internally probably most of us oppose it but that shouldn’t be where Dave speaks from. As the Alliance, as Dave, it’s good for him to say we have these concerns.

Sue: At this point it’s an appropriation right? If we are waiting on an external report is it a good strategy for us to ask in the appropriation that the legislature consider this alternative project reports or do the same study?

Dave: This gets more into tactics.

Sue: I’m looking at it from the Legislative perspective. We should ask the state to do some of the same alternative study

Emily: As it’s written, adding the caveat that we don’t have a position, is this position something you are comfortable with in Juneau?

Dave: Yes. I’m comfortable having this guide my work for the next year.

Sue: Do they write us off if we don’t have a position?

Dave: They are intrigued that we don’t have a position.

Andy: It’s okay to have concerns but not have a firm position.

Nelson: I oppose ‘while all energy projects have impacts’ I feel it should be changed to ‘There are a number of potential alternatives that must be studied to ensure we choose the most cost-effective, low impact options to Skip sentence. We believe there are viable economic and environmentally appropriate alternatives to this mega-project. We are committed to helping...’

Sue: What is the likelihood of a successful appropriation this year? For our members..

Dave: It’s very probable this would pass and we aren’t trying to defeat the appropriation.

Sue: We could ask that they spend the same amount on alternative projects. I think we should be specific.

Dave: I want to have something passed before session.

Sue: As long as it conveys that you ask that the appropriation includes review of alternative projects.

Dave: Can we ask for a vote?

***Dave:* Any one opposed to adopting the position paper with the amendments? Hearing none it is approved.**

***Andy:* Coastal Management Conversation.** Do we support it and what are we going to do about it? On the initiative itself?

Mark- I was involved in Mat-Su when this was going away. One thing he said was about people being upset about this. Unfortunately those are the people who actually understand and care. I think it's a tough sell.

Andy- Do we like the initiative?

Dan- We had a priority that is still on the books that would have advocated this and it matches what we wanted. It's basically the same. Better than what we were hoping for in the legislature.

Dave and David agree.

Trish- They want our support but not publically. We had a meeting about this. They don't want us to be out front in this. They want us to get signatures and give money but they don't want us to be publically vocal on this. When we decide what position to take, we should think about whether or not we build power from this. If we don't, then why are we being involved?

Jed: We are already on record with our position and it was one of our top priorities. It was very popular as a priority last year. I feel pretty strongly that we backed off and weren't out front and were hands off yet we have the priority and didn't do anything on it. That was frustrating. We should be involved. How sweet would it be to deliver 20k signatures and be like 'boom, in your face'?

Polly- For anyone who doesn't know this issue, can we have a sound bite about how it will benefit our communities?

Jed- It gives communities a legitimate voice in resource extraction projects.

Dave- It gives communities power to guide development. Not a yes or no vote, but guidance.

Lois- In the Arctic, it makes the Alaska state rules that are tougher than the federal rules apply.

Dave- We asked for the citizens advisory council and removal of the DEC carve-out and the initiative does both of these things.

Andy- Do we put our face on this and go ahead, do we quietly assist, or do we not do anything?

Dan: I think we should be public about it.

Nelson: This will require resources and time so we need to make a commitment to it.

Mike- Having worked on these initiatives in the past, it is difficult to get these signatures during this time of the year. The task of gathering all these signatures during the 5 coldest, darkest weeks of the year is impossible in my opinion. I just want to state that fact. Even if everyone in this room spent all of their time doing this, I think we would fail. The conservation community would have our face on that failure. For 2014, I think that's doable. Don't set yourself up for failure.

_____: Would they be valid for next year?

Mike: It would still be failure

Polly- Is there an alternative?

Mike- We could gather signatures with the idea that it would be on the 2014 ballot.

Sue- If they don't get the signatures in the five weeks, what is the next time place you can use those signatures?

Mike- When they start circulating the booklets, they have 365 days to gather the signatures.

David- Those signatures could leverage a bill in 2013. You might not have to wait until 2014. But you are losing the next session.

Andy- Hesitation on getting them in the 5 weeks?

Everyone: Yes.

Nick- I think it's important to support our priority.

Nelson- If we say we won't get the signatures until mid spring we won't fail. We can try.

Jed- It's not on just us to get the signatures. There are other organizations working on this.

Andy- Do people feel ready to say that we want to put our face with this with pride not attaching the January deadline?

Trish- Let's vote on whether we support it. Then we can talk about what we can do. Lots of people need to go back to their boards/organization to discuss. This will be time and resources. That is the longer discussion, what resources we are willing to give.

Andy- Do we support the initiative?

Vote- All voting members voted yes except Trish who abstained.

Nick- We can't support this without being public.

Trish- We won't issue a press release. Bruce won't tell the press that we support that. He will only need it if he uses it.

Nelson- If we support it internally we should tell the public that we support it. Question, how much resources do we give to it?

Sue: Regardless of the importance of the issue I want to be at the table when decisions are made *about strategies. If the other groups don't know we are there then I don't want to be involved.*

Pat: So we tell Bruce that we want to have the issue and put our face on it.

Sue: He hasn't thought about how to bring the Anchorage folks into it. I want to think about how we lost. I don't know where those sticking points are but I suspect that they are in Anchorage. If we are putting resources into it then I want to build political capital.

Andy- So basically we agree on 'We support your initiative but we want to sit at the table and here are the resources we are willing to give you.'

Nelson- We support the initiative, we are going to talk about the resources and by the way will be have a seat at the table. And let that decide how much resources we give.

Sue- There has to be a geographic specificity too.

Andy- we support the initiative. It seems like we have a desire to keep talking about this. We will do an analysis at the Alliance and we will have a call about how we can help next week. Please discuss the resources you have available at your organizations.

Common Agenda Priority Discussion

Karen: We amended the transportation priority so that the Opportunities section is taken out and just the threats section left in.

Dan: We had some input that maybe we should put a little bit more emphasis on starting the discussion with utilities about the importance of an independent entity for energy efficiency.

Pat: There are active discussions about a third party entity for energy efficiency. We have a general sense of what it does. There won't be a bill this session but they are working out the details. We could be priming legislators. So it would be in the sphere of work down in Juneau.

Jessie: We are open to a Southcentral piece if it is applicable and appropriate.

Peg: Just make sure that there is language that appliances changed out are picked up and recycled.

Mark: Question on the energy proposal. Does it include a component of embracing appropriation for current renewable energy and emerging energy tech funds?

Dan: No, Alliance staff will work on it but not the SAF organizers. This isn't our vision for this.

Casey- I want to say that the transportation, we are a big supporter of the transportation fund but after having conversations with people here, it became apparent that the real focus of this group is the Roads to Resources and not the fund. We pulled it so people would be able to support the proposal.

Jed: The fund won't go away. The mechanism might not be passed this year but it won't go away. We can incorporate it into our future, longer term strategy.

Casey: We know that if we pull it off the table as the priority it doesn't mean that you don't have our support. We keep coming back to this table and keep pushing our priorities because we know we have your support and we appreciate that.

Pat: What are we asking on the transportation then?

Karen: Capital budget. The priority will pay attention to the capital budget and the projects.

Jed: Procedural question. Priority vs. position. Can we turn this transportation omnibus package into a position like Susitna? Maybe we don't do priority since we don't really know where it is going but take a position instead? Or do we have to make it a priority?

Dave: Good question for sponsor group. The SAF organizers wouldn't be assigned to it. It would be an ancillary issue that I would work on with other Alliance staff.

David: So the priorities are the only things that SAF organizers work on? That hasn't always been the case. We used to fill the holes of time with other issues.

Dave: To the sponsor groups of the transportation -are you interested in changing it to a position?

Karen: No

Trish: The reason we take positions is because there isn't a piece of legislation. Roads to Resources has a piece of legislation- the capital budget. We don't know what it will be but we can fight it. The position is longer term. The immediate need is to look at what is showing up in the capital budget.

Lois: Can we influence what is in the budget beforehand? Maybe working with some of the governor's staff or meeting with the DOT commissioner?

David R-: This is strategy.

Colleen-: Expand our base. It's unclear to me which of these priorities will fortify and expand our base.

Jessie-: The energy proposal will be a win-win for not only environmental groups but also economics- community benefit. We can join with utility ratepayers, community members. It will save people money. Clean Energy and Energy Efficiency are wins for everyone.

David-: The legislature has recognized our efforts and praised us for it.

Peg: Coastal Management allows us to talk to rural people and others that we might not have.

Lois-: Transportation- we need to spend our now declining transportation dollars responsibly. To focus on things that will make life better for people. We need to fix current infrastructure instead of starting large new projects. We could have a positive transportation agenda as well.

Pat: Is the coastal zone management on our choice list?

David: It's an existing priority.

Dave: Initiative would be outside the building while a proposal would be in the building.

Pat: Common Agenda Priorities would be in the building and not outside the building.

Trish: We were told not to talk to people about the coastal zone.

David-: We were always told that and we support it with SAF organizers. It's always an issue and we do it anyways.

Megan: I'm thinking about HR. If we are going to spend time on the initiative then maybe we don't have the capacity to take on three additional proposals.

Dave: We are restructuring the SAF program in the next few months.

Polly: You could just choose two priorities instead.

Emily: We are looking at the four priorities. To those people in the buildings, these four proposals are what they think the greenies care about. Do we want to add Susitna? It's capital budget too.

Dan: Let's not confuse priorities with work in legislature. SEACC is not interested in Susitna. We should have been talking about this before instead of now.

Lissa: This list determines our work plan during the session.

Dave: Lots of questions. Should we select three proposals? Do we only select two and try to fit the initiative into this somewhere? We want to do the will of the group. If that makes sense.

Dan: There are enough uncertainties around the coastal zone. We don't know if they want us involved, we don't know if we have the resources. It doesn't seem to be mature enough right now. I'd like to vote to rescind it and then pick three new ones.

Sue: Procedural question. Capital budget line items. We know there will be roads, energy efficiency, etc. I'm confused on the semantics.

Dave: It's a dedication of resources issue. In the lead up to the session SAF organizers, EDs will all come together to work on a plan to work on the three proposals. That doesn't happen on the other issues.

David: The lobbying happens with the other issues though. It influences how the legislators think of us. They are important statements on how we are viewed.

Sue: Do we have more than we can handle? Are we trying to eliminate something?

Trish: We do look at things in a 2 year session. We have a bill in play, the PBDE bill. I think it deserves to have our support regardless of whether or not it's a priority. We should vote on what we want to do with Coastal Zone. The energy efficiency is gone so the new one would be voted on.

David: You could ask for more money for the businesses.

Trish: I think we should vote on whether or not we release coastal zone as a priority.

Dave: Do we want to release the coastal zone management priority? This has nothing to do with the initiative and what we are doing there.

Dan: We wanted to be working on it but they didn't want to be associated with us and we couldn't work on it.

Dave: I don't think it's going to be timely. The legislators don't want to deal with it.

Trish: If something did show up, the House and Senate aren't going to agree on it. When we have a stalled priority it is really frustrating.

Dave- **All in favor? Many 'yes's, no objections, no abstentions.**

Coastal Zone is not a priority.

Mark: Can we vote on whether the PBDE is still a priority or not?

Trish: Do we keep the PBDE bill?

All in favor, no objections

PBDE will continue to be a priority.

Trish: My thought on the energy efficiency priority for last year is that what we proposed, we got. We could ask for more but it makes more sense to ask for something different -to add on to that. We got our win. We can remove that priority. Can we remove the Energy Efficiency priority?

Dave: All in favor of removing the EE priority

All in favor, no objections

Energy Efficiency is no longer a priority

Dave: Do we have more questions about the three new proposed priorities? We are going to do a private vote this year. We will give people about 15 minutes to vote and will gather back as a group to determine which. We are picking top 2.

Representatives and voting member groups

Alaska Center for the Environment- Sue

Alaska Mobility Coalition- Casey

Sierra Club- Emily

Alliance- Peg

Voters- Peg

NWF- Pat

SEACC- Dan

The Wilderness Society- Lois

ACAT- Heidi Zimmer

Trustees- Trish

NAEC- Karen

Denali Citizens Council- Nancy Bale

Friends of Mat-Su- Mark Mastellar

Cascadia- Mark

Votes are counted: 11 for Transportation, 2 for Wildlife, and 10 for the Clean Energy proposal

Andy- The priorities for the 2012 session are PBDE, Transportation, and Clean Energy
Anything we should know for next year. Process changes?

Megan: We should have heard the panel before the proposals were presented.

Polly: Have the conversations about the lay of the land politically before proposals are created?
We have 4-5 loss cross cutting campaigns across the state and I think there is a silo between the Alliance process and what is happening in those campaigns.

Emily- On some of these big issues, coal mining, we all understand the political reality of our state and it would be good if we could start from the very beginning talking about legislative hearings, etc. It would be nice to have the conversations that we have with these other coalitions with Alliance so that we can utilize Alliance's resources.

Nick- We should have started sooner. We could have chosen priorities in the spring. We could debrief in the spring. Also we could have two year priorities.

Lissa- Something from the End of session from this year was to develop working groups so that member groups could be involved with the SAF organizers. We can see who is interested in working on these issues. So that it isn't just the organizations that house the SAF organizers that participate.

Andy- I heard timing brought up and I think that is a good one.

Dan- You have to wait until after elections. The second year in the legislature you could do it earlier but normally we don't change.

Sue- I would support doing this earlier.

Andy- Consensus is that it is late this year.

Dan- In other ways we aren't late enough to make great decisions.

Andy- We've had some requests to hold this on weekend days. What do you think about Friday/Saturday meetings?

Polly- They used to be.

IPC Business Portion of the meeting:

Trish: Each year at this time we vote in a new IPC co-chair. I've been for two years now and I'll be stepping down. Dan will stay and we need nominations for a new IPC chair.

Dave: I nominate Lissa Hughes

Trish: Any other?

All in favor of Lissa as IPC?

All in favor, no objections, motion passed

Lissa Hughes is the new IPC Chair. Dan Lesh is the incumbent. Lissa Hughes and Dan Lesh will co-chair the IPC for this upcoming year.

Vote to formally adopt the Transportation, Clean Energy and PBDE's Priorities

All in favor, no objections, motion passes.

Priorities for next year are Transportation, Clean Energy and PBDE for next year.