

## 4 National and International Interests

---

The Alaska Arctic Policy Commission, as part of its two year effort to identify the current state of the Arctic and make recommendations for responding to change and activity, recognizes that it shares that region with others who have jurisdictional authority. The Bering Strait, for instance, is an international waterway; the federal government controls waters outside three miles and within its Exclusive Economic Zone; and federal agencies own and manage federal lands within much of the Arctic. The Commission has produced a number of recommendations that speak to those issues outside its authority, as they relate directly to the health and well-being of Alaskans.

Generally, however,

- Alaska has been successfully developing our resources for the benefit of its people and as good stewards of the environment.
- To address the challenges and needs of Arctic residents requires continued responsible development of our natural resources.
- The risks to the Alaskan Arctic are international in scope, and Alaska is best prepared to adapt to changes and mitigate these risks with infrastructure made feasible only with continued development and investment.
- The federal government needs to be a partner in moving Alaska forward without overreaching or expanding its jurisdiction; as a partner it can open new areas to development, remove barriers to access and eliminate regulatory uncertainty.

The Alaska Arctic Policy Commission encourages the state to convey to the federal government:

1. Continued opposition to implementation of National Ocean Policy and Coastal Marine Spatial Planning (CMSP) that does not serve Alaska's unique needs.
2. Continued opposition to federal land withdrawals under the Antiquities Act
3. Continued support for U.S. ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, but with clear guidance on how to address:
  - Potential undermining of U.S. sovereignty via the International Seabed Authority and dispute resolution tribunals
  - Environmental activism that results in bad domestic policy
  - U.N. bureaucracy that stifles participation or supplants national jurisdiction
  - Ensuring freedom of seas and clear navigation rights, as well as intelligence or military activities
4. Support for the preparation of submission of an extended Continental Shelf claim in Alaska
5. Support for opening ANWR to oil and gas exploration and production in the 1002 Area

Additionally, the Alaska Arctic Policy Commission recommends that the U.S. government and federal agencies consider:

1. Sufficiently funding the U.S. Coast Guard to carry out its assigned and emerging duties in the U.S. maritime Arctic without compromising its capacity to conduct all Alaskan missions.
2. Replacing the U.S. Coast Guard's Polar Class icebreakers and increasing the number of ice-capable cutters.
3. Addressing within amendments to the Magnuson Stevens Act policies that maximize the value and use of an emerging Arctic fishery
4. Establishing of federal revenue sharing with the state and impacted communities from resource development opportunities on the Arctic OCS.
5. Collaborating on the implementation of the IMO Polar Code so that it meets the state's interests and recognizes its priorities
6. Funding sufficiently the federal agencies whose mission it is to provide baseline data, monitoring, mapping, charting and forecasting.
7. Designating a single coordinating agency, and identifying a designated funding stream, that will be responsive to climate change impacts requiring community relocation.

As it regards offshore development, the AAPC recommends to the federal government that it:

- Support Arctic-specific rules for Arctic OCS activity, including BOEM and BSEE's Arctic-specific regulations under OCSLA, and call for demonstrated continual improvement by both the regulators and the regulated operators to ensure the safest possible oil and gas operations on the U.S. Arctic OCS.
- Encourage federal regulators to standardize conditions for OCS exploration by moving conditions out of individual leases and permits where appropriate and into the regulations themselves, recognizing that some degree of individualized conditionality is needed for flexibility.
- Support the State of Alaska in working with federal regulators toward a "near miss" incidents database and Arctic-specific safety systems design and installation requirements
- Establish an ongoing state-federal public forum on Arctic OCS Risk Management and Process Safety
- Encourage continued circumpolar cooperation between regulators and other stakeholders
- Support concrete, on-the-ground examples of state-federal Integrated Arctic Management (IAM) to convert this vague concept to a practical tool for improved safety, risk management and project success

Finally, it is worth recognizing the priorities that the federal government has in the region, and their intersection with the state of Alaska:

- Marine stewardship and protection of the environment – the Commission recognizes that the vast majority of the maritime environment is under federal jurisdiction and that the state will provide clear guidance to federal agencies referencing Alaskan priorities. However, the Alaska Arctic Policy Commission does not support new maritime protected areas that are not designated by the state.
- Climate change – the Commission understands climate change to be a global challenge that has important implications for the state of Alaska, many of which act as drivers for a conversation now about Arctic policy. The state will continue to work with federal agencies to respond appropriately and prudently. Any measure to mitigate climate change from within Alaska would have very serious negative impacts on the residents of the state. The Alaska Arctic Policy Commission recommends federal agencies focus on ways for Alaskan communities to adapt to a changing climate.