

ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE
HOUSE COMMUNITY AND REGIONAL AFFAIRS STANDING COMMITTEE

April 5, 2011

8:08 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Representative Cathy Engstrom Munoz, Chair
Representative Neal Foster, Vice Chair
Representative Alan Austerman
Representative Alan Dick
Representative Dan Saddler
Representative Sharon Cissna (via teleconference)
Representative Berta Gardner

MEMBERS ABSENT

All members present

COMMITTEE CALENDAR

HOUSE BILL NO. 183

"An Act relating to the Village Safe Water Act."

- MOVED CSHB 183(CRA) OUT OF COMMITTEE

OVERVIEW: UPDATE ON THE ENERGY EFFICIENCY POLICY &
RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE COLD CLIMATE HOUSING RESEARCH CENTER

- HEARD

PREVIOUS COMMITTEE ACTION

BILL: HB 183

SHORT TITLE: APPLICATION OF VILLAGE SAFE WATER ACT

SPONSOR(S): REPRESENTATIVE(S) DICK

03/09/11	(H)	READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS
03/09/11	(H)	CRA, FIN
04/05/11	(H)	CRA AT 8:00 AM BARNES 124

WITNESS REGISTER

SHELIA PETERSON, Staff
Representative Dick
Alaska State Legislature
Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Presented HB 183 on behalf of the sponsor, Representative Dick.

BILL GRIFFITH, Program Manager
Facility Programs
Division of Water
Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC)
Anchorage, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: During hearing of HB 183, answered questions.

KATHIE WASSERMAN, Executive Director
Alaska Municipal League
Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in support of HB 183.

JASON MAYRAND, Mayor
City of Nenana
Nenana, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Urged passage of HB 183 this session.

SCOTT RUBY, Director
Division of Community & Regional Affairs
Department of Commerce, Community & Economic Development
Anchorage, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: During hearing of HB 183, answered questions.

DR. JOHN DAVIES, Senior Researcher - Energy Policy
Cold Climate Housing Research Center (CCHRC)
Fairbanks, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Provided an update on the energy efficiency policy and recommendations by CCHRC.

ACTION NARRATIVE

[8:08:35 AM](#)

CHAIR CATHY ENGSTROM MUNOZ called the House Community and Regional Affairs Standing Committee meeting to order at 8:08 a.m. Representatives Foster, Austerman, Dick, Saddler, Cissna (via teleconference), Gardner, and Munoz were present at the call to order.

HB 183-APPLICATION OF VILLAGE SAFE WATER ACT

[8:08:47 AM](#)

CHAIR MUNOZ announced that the first order of business would be HOUSE BILL NO. 183, "An Act relating to the Village Safe Water Act."

8:09:12 AM

SHELIA PETERSON, Staff, Representative Dick, Alaska State Legislature, paraphrased from the following sponsor statement:

House Bill 183 amends the definition of "village" under the Village Safe Water Act. Currently an unincorporated community, a second class city, or a first class city with not more than 600 residents is eligible to receive a grant under the Village Safe Water Program. House Bill 183 amends the definition to include a home rule city with less than 600 residents.

A home rule city has the same government powers as a first class city. The difference rests in how the two cities are organized. A first class city is established under AS 29.35.50-260 while a home rule city adopts a charter as the framework for the city.

Four years ago the City of Nenana as awarded a Village Safe Water grant to upgrade an aging water and sewer system. The city worked diligently with state officials for several years to plan and finalize the project. Unfortunately, right before construction was to begin, the Department of Environmental Conservation notified Nenana that the city was not eligible to receive a Village Safe Water grant; the city was not a first class city, but a home rule city.

The change in HB 183 allows the City of Nenana to proceed with the needed upgrade to its water and sewer system using Village Safe Water funds. Passage of HB 183 this year ensures that a construction season is not lost.

8:10:46 AM

REPRESENTATIVE GARDNER inquired as to who establishes the terms for the grants.

MS. PETERSON deferred to Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) staff.

[8:11:19 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE GARDNER questioned whether it would be possible to merely change the definitions of the grant such that the language specified that home rule cities are eligible for grants rather than changing the definition of a home rule city.

MS. PETERSON clarified that the definition of "village" is in statute and is explicit in terms of what type of organized community qualifies. Therefore, to add a different type [of organized community] the statute would have to be changed, which is what HB 183 does. Ms. Peterson added that there is companion legislation in the Senate Finance Committee. The Senate Community and Regional Affairs Standing Committee adopted a committee substitute (CS) for that companion legislation and a blank CS mirroring the Senate CS has been provided to the committee.

[8:12:40 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE AUSTERMAN asked if there has been any discussion regarding an effective date.

MS. PETERSON related that she and the sponsor have noticed that HB 183 doesn't have an effective date, and therefore they might ask the committee to consider an effective date.

[8:13:04 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE FOSTER said that he fully supports expanding the definition if it results in more communities being eligible. He then inquired as to the consequences of removing the existing statutory language referring to the two-mile radius.

MS. PETERSON confirmed that Version M does delete the existing statutory language referring to a two-mile radius.

[8:15:00 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE SADDLER asked if this change would impact communities other than Nenana.

[8:15:27 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE AUSTERMAN moved to adopt the proposed committee substitute (CS) for HB 183, Version 27-LS0601\M, Bullard,

3/30/11, as the working document. There being no objection, Version M was before the committee.

8:15:40 AM

BILL GRIFFITH, Program Manager, Facility Programs, Division of Water, Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC), said that under Version M several communities would be impacted. The home rule municipality change would allow Nenana and Yakutat to qualify for village safe water funding. Increasing the population allowed under the statute for first class cities and home rule municipalities from 600 residents to 1,000 residents would result in several more communities being included. Several of the communities that would now be included have just recently surpassed a population of 600, such as Akiachuk and Kipnuk. He noted that several other communities have been at a population of more than 600 residents, but haven't been eligible for some time. Those communities include King Cove, Hoonah, and Sand Point. There are also communities, such as Kake and Kasigluk, with a population of over 550 that would soon be ineligible if the population doesn't increase. Mr. Griffith pointed out that Version M also includes a change that specifies which unincorporated communities would be included. That change requires that the community has an established local government, either a city or tribal government. Therefore, some currently eligible communities without a city or tribal government would become ineligible. However, these communities could become eligible again by forming a second class city. In response to Representative Saddler, Mr. Griffith guessed that there are probably dozens of unincorporated cities or cities without a tribal government. He noted that although most of those communities haven't requested village safe water funds, a handful of communities have.

8:18:17 AM

REPRESENTATIVE FOSTER expressed interest in which communities would be impacted, particularly if any are in his district. Representative Foster then related a situation in which the village of Sheldon Point recently changed its name to Nunam Iqua, and asked if that would be a problem.

MR. GRIFFITH replied no.

8:19:35 AM

REPRESENTATIVE GARDNER related her understanding that Version M makes changes to move from an unincorporated community to a village listed in 43. U.S.C. 1610 or 1615.

MR. GRIFFITH agreed with her understanding and offered to provide a copy of that list.

[8:20:22 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE GARDNER surmised that the aforementioned is a bit different than the sponsor's intent.

REPRESENTATIVE DICK, in response to Representative Foster's earlier question, estimated that there may be eight villages in Representative Foster's district that might benefit from this proposed change. He then directed attention to a document in the committee packet that specifies the villages that will be eligible [for village safe water funding under Version M].

MR. GRIFFITH, referring to the list, pointed out that the second class cities would remain eligible because the statute will continue to have no population limit for second class cities.

[8:21:41 AM](#)

KATHIE WASSERMAN, Executive Director, Alaska Municipal League, testified in favor of HB 183 as it addresses an issue that has been in play for many years. Municipalities and communities with all the attributes of "smaller ones" have been left out of [the ability to qualify for village safe water funds] because of their populations or differing status. With regard to Representative Foster's earlier question, the village of Nunam Iqua would be fine as it's still a municipality. Those communities that have difficulties with elections likely have a tribal government or a municipal government and would likely [remain eligible for village safe water funds]. One of the issues with programs that provide services or pockets of funds to unincorporated communities with no tribal or municipal government, is regarding to whom the check is given and held responsible in terms of ensuring the project is completed. Therefore, the language defining ["village" as the specified organized communities] is appropriate since it requires the residents in the community to assign someone as the head of the community to at least receive the funds and be responsible to the state in terms of the use of the funds.

[8:23:32 AM](#)

CHAIR MUNOZ requested that Ms. Wasserman explain the different types of community organization.

MS. WASSERMAN explained that a home rule city is guided by a charter, although it has ordinances. First class cities are responsible for their education, have a planning and zoning commission, and can levy a property tax. Second class cities are usually much smaller and aren't required to provide as much paperwork or responsibility in order to operate the city, save one exception. She agreed with Ms. Peterson that it would be difficult to change the status through regulations. In further response to Chair Munoz, Ms. Wasserman said a second class city has sales tax authority. Although a second class city may have property tax authority, she didn't believe any levy it. A home rule city may levy a property tax.

8:25:30 AM

REPRESENTATIVE FOSTER, referring to the document specifying new communities eligible under Version M, inquired as to why St. Mary's, a first class city with a population of 507, would be a newly eligible community rather than a community that is already qualified. He further inquired as to why St Mary's wasn't already eligible.

MS. WASSERMAN responded that she would've also assumed St. Mary's would've been eligible all along and wouldn't know why they aren't.

8:26:38 AM

JASON MAYRAND, Mayor, City of Nenana, informed the committee that the City of Nenana is a home rule municipality and has done its utmost to be self-sufficient, reliable, and independent of the state. He highlighted the common understanding of the state that communities should keep their government as close to the people as possible, which Nenana has done by incorporating and having its own charter. Of all home rule municipalities organized as home rule, Nenana is the smallest by far. This legislation would allow replacement of 35 year old infrastructure, the water and sewer system. He informed the committee that the City of Nenana filed its application, the grant documents were accepted, and the grants appropriated. Shortly thereafter, Nenana's ineligibility was found. He acknowledged that there is the possibility of going through the Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) project, Safe

Water and Clean Water funds for which the state provides 85 percent of the grant with a 15 percent match. The city utilized the aforementioned back in 2000 for a short expansion project which resulted in a debt of \$520,000, the 15 percent. Therefore, the City of Nenana is paying about \$3,400 a month for the next 20 years to repay that loan. Although that doesn't seem like a lot, the municipality operates on about \$600,000 per year. With the increases in energy costs and health care costs and payroll for city employees very little is left to do any capital projects. Mayor Mayrand stressed that the City of Nenana's water plant could fail any day. Although maintenance for the water plant is high, the city has good operators. In fact, the prime operator for the City of Nenana's sanitation system was recently awarded operator of the year for the state. He opined that the aforementioned illustrates that Nenana is responsible and takes care of its systems. In conclusion, Mayor Mayrand requested that HB 183 be passed this session as time is of the essence.

[8:30:32 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE SADDLER inquired as to the project the City of Nenana borrowed money from the state.

MAYOR MAYRAND specified that it was an extension project for lines that provide sufficient capacity for the required sprinkler system in the Nenana Student Living Center.

[8:31:40 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE GARDNER asked if the changes encompassed in Section 1 of Version M would impact other programs or opportunities.

[8:32:22 AM](#)

SCOTT RUBY, Director, Division of Community & Regional Affairs, Department of Commerce, Community & Economic Development, answered that he didn't believe the changes in HB 183 will impact other programs because the definition is specific to the eligibility of the Village Safe Water Program.

[8:33:06 AM](#)

CHAIR MUNOZ, upon determining no one else wished to testify, closed public testimony.

[8:33:24 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE AUSTERMAN moved that the committee adopt a conceptual amendment to include an immediate effective date for HB 183. There being no objection, it was adopted.

[8:33:46 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE GARDNER inquired as to the statute for the Village Safe Water grants.

REPRESENTATIVE SADDLER answered AS 46.07.010.

[8:34:40 AM](#)

The committee took an at-ease from 8:34 a.m. to 8:36 a.m.

[8:36:34 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE SADDLER asked if the adoption of the immediate effective date to HB 183 will allow Nenana to process its grant application and begin the project this construction season.

REPRESENTATIVE DICK replied yes.

[8:37:06 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE AUSTERMAN moved to report the proposed CS for HB 183, Version 27-LS0601\M, Bullard, 3/30/11, as amended, out of committee with individual recommendations and the accompanying fiscal notes. There being no objection, CSHB 183(CRA) was reported from the House Community and Regional Affairs Standing Committee.

The committee took a brief at-ease.

Overview: Update on the Energy Efficiency Policy & Recommendations by the Cold Climate Housing Research Center

[8:39:33 AM](#)

CHAIR MUNOZ announced that the final order of business would be an update on the energy efficiency policy and recommendations by the Cold Climate Housing Research Center (CCHRC).

[8:39:46 AM](#)

DR. JOHN DAVIES, Senior Researcher - Energy Policy, Cold Climate Housing Research Center (CCHRC), began by relating that energy, its cost and availability are crucial issues across the state, but particularly in rural Alaska. Many communities are struggling with the idea of whether they are even sustainable under the current circumstances. One of the solutions is the concerted effort to improve the efficiency with which energy is developed. He encouraged the committee to consider energy efficiency as a resource. Significant investments in energy efficiency can achieve the effective provision of energy at rates that are comparable to the provision of large power plants or oil and gas fields. Dr. Davies reminded the committee that CCHRC produced a report in 2008 that identified the energy policy options for the state. Although a large amount [of the recommendations in the report] have been adopted, much remains to be done. A working group of energy experts met on March 2, 2011, to review and access the report. The [CCHRC] is engaged in a long-term effort to expand the scope of the report to include transportation and industrial uses. The plan is to complete the report by December 2011.

8:43:06 AM

DR. DAVIES began his slide presentation entitled "Alaska Energy Efficiency Policy Update of 2008 Report by CCHRC." He informed the committee that the 2008 report was managed by CCHRC, but funded by the Alaska Energy Authority (AEA) and the Alaska Housing Finance Corporation (AHFC) and was staffed by Information Insights. Referring to the slide entitled "Energy Efficiency Edge," Dr. Davies related that energy efficiency is colloquially referred to as "the low hanging fruit." Energy efficiency is something that can be done now and it doesn't require further study. Energy efficiency is receiving the same output for less input and it largely relies on advancing technologies. Furthermore, energy efficiency reduces dependency on fossil fuels and often costs less than any alternative. Moreover, a reduction in energy use reduces pollution and carbon dioxide emissions. The 2008 report had 23 policy recommendations in 9 categories, which are listed on slide 5. The main drivers of the improvements were Senate Bill 297/330 in 2008. Those pieces of legislation expanded the weatherization program and created the energy efficiency rebate program. A significant amount of funds were appropriated for that effort. In 2010 House Bill 306 established a state energy policy and pointed out that supply and demand for fossil fuels and the concern over climate change will impact the price of fossil fuels, which is occurring now as the price of fuel has topped

\$100 per barrel. The state's energy policy had several pieces to it, including pieces focusing on energy efficiency, economic development, research, education, workforce development, and coordination of government functions. The other major piece of legislation in 2010 was Senate Bill 220, which established the following programs and funds: Alaska Energy Efficiency Revolving Loan Fund, The Southeast Energy Fund, Emerging Energy Technology Fund, Alternative Energy Conservation Revolving Loan Fund, and Alaska Affordable Heating Program. The legislation also addressed public facilities and building an energy use database, public vehicles, and nuclear power. Moreover, Senate Bill 220 discussed the need for outreach with public education and provided tools for municipalities and agencies to help deliver the services.

DR. DAVIES informed the committee that the present effort is funded by AEA with a grant from the U.S. Department of Energy. He reiterated that he wanted to review what has been done since 2008 and then expand that in the final scopes to include transportation and industrial uses of energy. The 2008 report was largely focused on the Railbelt because there was an assumption that there had been a study addressing rural Alaska just prior [to the 2008 report]. However, there was much in that report addressing rural Alaska. Therefore, the current desire is to expand it to be statewide and determine the real issues and how to improve those in every area of the state. He then moved on to slides 16-18 entitled "Score Sheet for 2008 Report," which assesses each recommendation. He reviewed the various recommendations and percent complete of each. The recommendations include state leadership, funding energy efficiency, public education and outreach, baseline data, existing residential buildings, new residential buildings, existing commercial buildings, new commercial buildings, and public buildings. With regard to the need for baseline data, he remarked that it's surprising how little is known about how much energy is used in the various types of buildings throughout the state. Currently, there is a large effort coordinated by AEA and AHFC to obtain the baseline data. Still, there's a need to provide funding to keep the effort going. Dr. Davies pointed out that even with the fairly significant funds put forth to address the recommendations for existing residential buildings, only 3 percent of the households in the state have been addressed. As the unencumbered funds are expended, the expectation is to reach 10 percent of the households in the state. Therefore, 90 percent of the homes in Alaska are left. With regard to new residential buildings, Dr. Davies opined that residential buildings continue to be built to a standard that's

too low. The working group felt that the top priority is to establish a statewide energy code. The same issues apply to commercial buildings. Under Senate Bill 210 in 2010, there was a significant effort to make the revolving loan fund available for many public buildings. The goal was to address 25 percent of the public buildings larger than 10,000 square feet. He opined that the public buildings program is on the right track. Dr. Davies said that although about 60 percent of the things set out in 2008 have been accomplished, much remains to be done.

[8:54:43 AM](#)

DR. DAVIES, in response to Representative Saddler, reviewed the key for the codes used in the spreadsheets on slides 16-18. He related that "FFF" means that a funding program has been established and "f" means funding is available with no specific program.

[8:57:43 AM](#)

DR. DAVIES, referring to slide 19, reviewed the top five recommendations from the 2011 working group, as follows:

1. Statewide Energy Efficiency Code
2. Sustainably fund Weatherization and Rebate Programs
3. Education - outreach, training, K-U courses
4. Utilities-based End-Use Electrical Efficiency Programs, consider decoupling mechanisms
5. Legislate efficiency as a priority

DR. DAVIES noted that although the 2008 funding was remarkable and substantial, it would only reach 10 percent of the houses statewide. Therefore, he expressed the need for sustainable funding to be available.

[8:59:34 AM](#)

CHAIR MUNOZ inquired as to how a statewide energy code would work in communities without planning and zoning or local codes.

DR. DAVIES answered that a statewide energy code is most effective through the financing of the buildings. In fact, de facto in many places the banks control the standards. Still, it's variable across the state. Therefore, CCHRC advocates the state adopting a standard that anyone who seeks a loan would have to use. However, at this point he didn't believe there is

a need to create a large inspection system, but rather allow the existing mechanisms used by banks and other financing agencies.

9:01:10 AM

DR. DAVIES, with regard to recommendation 4, said that not much has been done to address electrical use. Although there are a variety of programs to address electrical efficiency, they are usually delivered through utilities. For example, Golden Valley Electric Association has a program in which an auditor comes out to the consumer's house and makes specific suggestions as to how to save energy. Dr. Davies opined that the Regulatory Commission of Alaska (RCA) should be empowered to review these programs. Currently, the RCA is beginning with an information docket, which is a formal process to start assembling information that relates to this topic. The RCA is careful not to extend its authority beyond what the legislature has granted, and therefore it'll be important for the legislature to provide the RCA guidance. Dr. Davies then turned to the fifth recommendation, which is to legislate efficiency as a priority. For example, if a large amount of funds are being provided for a power plant of some sort, the state, as a condition of receiving the grant, should require the agency and the community involved to consider what can be done to reduce the need. Therefore, achieving a reduction in demand through efficiencies at the same time additional energy is being provided. The aforementioned would incentivize the efficiency effort and may mean that the size of the project may not need to be as large. Many communities find that achieving efficiencies can result in reduced demand, and thus lengthen the life span of energy facilities. He then encouraged the committee to review slides 22-26 and the recommendations it believe will save an enormous amount of energy.

9:05:12 AM

DR. DAVIES, directing attention to slide 27 entitled "Energy Efficiency as a Resource," explained that the graph uses the Home Energy Rebate Program as an example. Approximately \$300 million has been provided to the weatherization and rebate programs. To date, about 10,000 homes have completed the program and achieved an average energy savings of 30 percent. The graph supposes that the [energy savings] achieved by the aforementioned 10,000 homes is extended to all 280,000 households in the state. Since that couldn't be achieved all at once, one must determine how fast it could be achieved. With the existing programs, about \$125 million per year is being

expended. If expenditures continue at that rate on residential programs, in about five years there would be a savings of about 7 trillion British thermal units (Btus) annually. Therefore, every year there would be 7 trillion Btus that were provided that don't need to be provided. He likened it to building a power plant to provide that energy, but it operates for free. After 10 years, the residential energy savings amounts to about 15 trillion Btus. He opined that if the state put aside \$4.5 billion and spent the earnings on residential energy efficiency, after about 7 years the energy savings would be equivalent to Anchorage's peak electrical load, about 380 megawatts a year. Therefore, it would be equivalent to building a power plant that provides all of Anchorage's electrical needs forever. After 12 years [of residential energy efficiency], the savings would be equivalent to the entire natural gas consumption in Alaska, about 18 trillion Btus. Dr. Davies emphasized that considering energy efficiency as a resource is potentially a very large resource.

[9:09:43 AM](#)

DR. DAVIES concluded by paraphrasing from slide 28 entitled "Conclusions":

It is imperative that we use our present wealth to develop an economy that is much less reliant on fossil fuels to assure a healthy and sustainable future.

One of the most cost-effective resources we have is energy efficiency and conservation.

The sustained energy and cost savings to businesses and homeowners from EE [energy efficiency] will result in reinvestment in Alaska's economy and stimulation of substantial economic growth.

Bottom Line - Sustained investment in EE will foster a more sustainable and vibrant economy.

DR. DAVIES pointed out that [sustained investment in energy efficiency] will mean that some of Alaska's communities will survive. Therefore, energy efficiency is crucial. He reminded the committee that it will be provided with CCHRC's full report once it has been finalized. He then expressed hope that a variety of the recommendations in the report will be considered and brought forth in legislation in the next few years.

[9:11:29 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE CISSNA related her understanding that the information today was from homes in the Railbelt.

DR. DAVIES clarified that the data is drawn from 10,000 homes throughout the state. The data has been analyzed in terms of each of the 40 House districts in order to understand how [programs] are applied across the state.

REPRESENTATIVE CISSNA emphasized that the state invests heavily in communities that can't sustain the projects that the state imposes on them. Therefore, large amounts of funds are wasted. She then asked if there has been any discussion of performing an analysis of what projects have been done per community or region.

DR. DAVIES characterized that as a huge issue. He emphasized that if the state is going to provide a facility in a village, it's important to design it to be the right size for the need in that particular village and to be as energy efficient as possible in order to minimize the operating costs. The aforementioned can mean the difference as to whether a village can maintain a facility. The village, he opined, needs to be involved such that a facility is utilized to maximize its potential and energy efficiency. One realm of the policy of recommendations is community and regional planning. Currently, AEA has an effort addressing community and regional planning, but it's mostly on the provision of power side. He opined that AEA's effort should be expanded, as should the scope such that it includes energy efficiency. The CCHRC has a sustainable northern communities program that, upon the invitation of the community, enters a community to help identify how to improve the efficiency of housing design. All of the aforementioned and more needs to be done to ensure that communities are developed in a sustainable fashion. Dr. Davies said that although an average reduction of 30 percent is great, he knew of specific examples in which a 90 percent reduction of energy usage has been achieved. For example, a Fairbanks apartment complex pooled its rebate money, about \$60,000, to reduce the energy consumption of the building by 90 percent. "We need to raise the bar, here," he said. If more is asked of the people who design and construct buildings in the state, the amount of energy used and the operating costs can be reduced substantially. However, this does require a different mindset, one that's all encompassing.

[9:18:22 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE DICK directed attention to slide 4, which mentions pollution and carbon dioxide reduction. He related his understanding from a constituent that .2 percent of the carbon dioxide production on the earth is anthropogenic while the rest is from volcanoes, oceans, and decaying plants. He further related that those in District 6 don't regard carbon dioxide production as a major threat to the environment.

DR. DAVIES said that although he didn't want to debate that issue, the production of carbon dioxide from fossil fuels is debated globally. Furthermore, the availability and cost of fuel is impacted by the debate. Whether [carbon dioxide production] is an issue for a particular area or not is an issue he would prefer to set aside in this discussion. Dr. Davies pointed out that if the state seeks energy efficiency, it saves funds and has the advantage of not being subject to the global debate.

[9:20:01 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE DICK expressed interest in the small villages surviving. However, the greatest inefficiencies in the villages are those things that were imposed by the government. Therefore, the first place to start is in the legislature and state departments.

DR. DAVIES agreed and opined that it's important, as a matter of policy, to review anything provided by the state. Furthermore, such integrated/coordinated discussions allow what people in the villages want and will accept to be known. For example, when CCHRC was asked to work in Anatumak Pass, they went there and spent three days talking with its residents. That local knowledge was combined with the technical information to develop a proposal to discuss with the community.

REPRESENTATIVE DICK interjected that often villagers don't consider the long-term consequences of projects the state offers.

DR. DAVIES agreed, but emphasized that the aforementioned type of [integrated/coordinated] process gets information out so that people can consider it.

[9:22:58 AM](#)

CHAIR MUNOZ thanked Dr. Davies, and related that the committee will continue to work with him on these priorities. She then discussed a possible interim schedule for the committee.

[9:24:52 AM](#)

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the committee, the House Community and Regional Affairs Standing Committee meeting was adjourned at 9:24 a.m.