



Agenda Statement

File #: RES 21-0030 **Version:** 1
Type: Resolution **Status:** Passed
File created: 7/28/2021 **In control:** City Council
On agenda: 8/3/2021 **Final action:** 8/3/2021
Title: #21-30 - Supporting Retention of Regional Stakeholder Committees for Stakeholder Engagement in the Alaska Regional Contingency Plan

Sponsors:

Indexes:

Code sections:

Attachments: 1. #21-30 - SUPPORTING RETENTION OF REGIONAL STAKEHOLDER COMMITTEES FOR STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT IN THE ALASKA REGIONAL CONTINGENCY PLAN, 2. Comments.2021 Regional C-Plan.2021-07-27.Final

Date	Ver.	Action By	Action	Result
8/3/2021	1	City Council	approved	Pass

ITEM TITLE:

#21-30 - Supporting Retention of Regional Stakeholder Committees for Stakeholder Engagement in the Alaska Regional Contingency Plan

SUBMITTED BY: Jake Staser, City Attorney

FISCAL NOTES:

Expenditure Required: N/A
Unencumbered Balance: N/A
Funding Source: N/A

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve Resolution supporting retention of regional stakeholder committees for stakeholder engagement in the Alaska Regional Contingency Plan.

SUMMARY STATEMENT:

ADEC has requested public comment on proposed revisions to the Alaska Regional Contingency Plan. The Alaska Regional Contingency Plan covers the entire state of Alaska and offshore waters that are subject to State and/ or federal jurisdiction. Comments are due by August 6, 2021.

The proposed revisions include a change to the stakeholder engagement mechanism to be utilized in the case of a spill. Specifically, the revisions would add the option to use a Multiagency Coordination Committee (MAC) instead of a Regional Stakeholder Committee (RSC).

MACs and RSCs serve different purposes. RSCs are intended to facilitate broad engagement of all stakeholders while MACs are intended to identify and guide the use of agency and governmental resources.

While the RSC expressly contemplates involvement of “local government representatives, community emergency coordinators, Regional Citizens Advisory Council representatives, landowners, leaseholders, and special interest groups” the MAC merely identifies “involved agencies and/or jurisdictions.”

The goal of an RSC is “is to include all local interested parties to ensure ideas and concerns are heard.”

Use of MACs in place of RSCs undermine this goal by limiting stakeholder participation to agencies and government officials with authority to direct incident command.

In addition, the definitions included in the proposed revisions conflict with established definitions in spill response publications, which unnecessarily adds confusion regarding how stakeholder engagement should occur in the case of a spill

If the use of MACs in Alaska spill response is justified, that mechanism should be available in addition to RSCs rather than in place of RSCs.