RUTGERS Edward J. Bloustein School

of Planning and Public Policy

Sustainable Arctic Villages and Oil Development?

Planning to avoid the natural resources curse

Studio Presentation, Spring 2013 Richard Bartholomew, Michael Brady, Kevin Dillon, Catriona Duncanson, Mary Martha Gaiennie, Sujee Jung, Kathryn McKelvey, Joshua Wilcox

Studio Advisor: Hal Salzman



Acknowledgements

- Ocean Conservancy
- National Science Foundation, Office of Polar Programs
- Nature Conservancy
- Tony Nelessen, Rutgers University
- Michael Phipps, Millennium Group International
- Greg Purvis, Linked Strong Services
- Audubon Alaska
- Jed Drolet, Alaska Energy Authority
- Anne Henshaw, Oak Foundation
- Glenn Sheehan, Barrow Arctic Science Consortium
- Anne Jensen, Ukpeaġvik Iñupiat Corporation
- Enrique Curchitser, Marine Science, Rutgers University



Arctic Ice Loss & Vessel Traffic



Source: NASA 2007

Source: Smith and Stephenson, 2013





- Respond to erosion, environmental threats, climate change
- Preserve community integrity
- Leverage development for community benefit



- Resource Development Background
- Wainwright Study Area
- Development Threats coastal erosion
- Development Scenarios
- Threats and Opportunities



North Slope Borough Oil and Gas Development – Impacts Assessment

 National Research Council 2003 report outlines NSB oil development threats and opportunities.



RUTGERS
Edward J. Bloustein School
of Planning and Public PolicyOil and Gas Development& Adaptive Capacity

Adaptive Capacity



RUTGERS Edward J. Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy Development Challenge Climate Change





 Research Question: How can NSB leverage off-shore oil activity to promote sustainable local development?

RUTGERS Edward J. Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy Current Wainwright Adaptation Strategy

• Protection, accommodation, retreat.

- 2008 storm destroyed Wainwright locally constructed sea wall; federal investment for a new sea wall.
- But, sea walls have been found generally unsuccessful in Alaska, partially due to permafrost problems.
- We explore ways to support a long-term retreat strategy.
- To better understand local erosion problems, and the potential mechanisms for retreat, we focus on Wainwright.

Sea walls found ineffective **source**: State of Alaska 2010, cited in National Climate Assessment 2013



Wainwright Study Area **Geographic Location**



Population Low Pop. High Pop. Incorporated Latitude Longitude Distance Census 2010 Estimate Estimate

349 Anaktuvuk Pass 324 1957 68° 08' -151° 45' 248 233 247 1983 70° 28' Atgasuk -157° 24' 58 4.212 4,709 1959 Barrow 71° 18' -156° 24' 239 272 Kaktovik 1971 70° 08' -143° 38' 317 402 436 Nuigsut 1975 70° 13' -150° 59' 154 774 674 Point Hope 1966 68° 21' -166° 47' 315 263 189 Point Lay 69° 46' -163° 03' 180 2,174 ---Prudhoe Bay 70° 20' -148° 30' 200 552 556 Wainwright 1962 70° 38' -160° 02' 87 9,003 7,602 NS Borough 1972



Notes and Sources

1. Village coordinates are from the 'Dictionary of Alaska Place Names.'

Population data is from the 'North' Slope Borough 2003 Economic Profile and Census Report', North Slope Borough Planning Department, 2003.

All distances are relative to Barrow

The North Slope Borough encompa an area of approximately 90,000 square miles.





Wainwright Study Area Demographics

• Population : 556

- -Ranked 4th populated village in North Slope Borough
- -15.1% of Population growth since 1998
 -low birth rates + migrants to city
- Major ethnicity

 Iñupiat (94.6%)
 - Shareholders the Olgoonik village corporation (23.5%) or Borough School District (21.9%)

Source: 2010 Census



2010 Population

2010 Wainwright Population by Ethnicity (%)



RUTGERS

Edward J. Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy

Wainwright Study Area

- Major Employment About 75 % of jobs from public sector
- High Unemployment Rate
 26.3% (U.S average 9.4%)
- Median Income
 - High income disparities by ethnicity
 - Wainwright < Alaska
 Per capita Income : \$28,000 < \$29,382
 Household Income : \$54,200 < \$66,712
 - Major Source of Income : dividends (median total \$ 23,226)

Area	Per capita Income	Median Household Income
Wainwright	\$28,000	\$54,200
Inupiat	\$25,200	\$50,000
Non-Inupiat	\$72,000	\$101,500
Alaska	\$29,382	\$66,712

Wainwright: Village Employers and Percentage of Employee 2010





- Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act

 Tribal revenues
 Dividends or investment in Corporation
- Commercial Opportunities
 - Olgoonik Oilfield Services
 - Olgoonik Logistics
 - Olgoonik Specialized Contractors
 - Olgoonik Technical Services



Physical Threats



Erosion Hazard Exposure

Wainwright Today

RUTGERS

Edward J. Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy



RUTGERS Subsistence Economy Subsistence Economy Edward J. Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy Exposure



4

2

8

Data Sources: ASGDC, ADFG, USFWS, ADFG, IUCN, USGS





Roadblocks

- Cost of delayed action
- Locating suitable land
- Financial cost (on the order of \$100 million per village)

Critical Cases

- Shishmaref
- Newtok





Let's not wait, lets PLAN— *defined as the application of foresight to action*









Scenario: No Oil Company Development

Scenario 1: No Development, Erosion Exposure Mitigation

UTGERS

Edward J. Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy



Scenario: No Oil Company Edward J. Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy **Development**

Scenario 1: No Development, Erosion Exposure Mitigation

RUTGERS





Scenario: Isolated Development

Scenario 2: Isolated



0

Observations via Google Earth / Bing Aerial & Digitizing



Scenario: Isolated Development

Scenario 2: Isolated



UTGERS Scenario: Integrated Development

Scenario 3: Integrated Development



RUTGERS Scenario: Integrated Development

Scenario 3: Integrated



Scenario: Hybrid Development

RUTGERS

Edward J. Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy

Scenario 4: Hybrid





Scenario: Hybrid Development

Scenario 4: Hybrid





Evaluation Criteria

- Impact of erosion
- Sea level rise
- Impact on infrastructure
- Energy infrastructure
- Airport
- Port/dock
- Spill response capacity
- Subsistence hunting
- Welfare of community
- Economic multiplier effect

RUTGERS

Edward J. Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy

Threats-Opportunities Analysis

	Scenario 4-	No Oil Development in Wainwright	Scena	ario 1- Isolated	Scenario 2- Integrated		Scenario 3- Hybrid Scenario	
Attributes	Threat	Opportunities	Threat	Opportunities	Threat	Opportunities	Threat	Opportunities
Impact of Erosion	Medium	Move houses outside of the build- to line.	Medium	Move those houses that are outside our new build-to line.	High	Move houses outside the build-to line, but request new types of buildings and materials.	High	Have the construction camp created to last so the community can move into it when it is no longer in use.
Sea Level Rise	High	Town has to move.	High	Town has to move.	High	Town has to move, but receives financial assistance from oil development.	High	Town moves into construction camp.
Impact on Infrastructure	Low/None	The town will have to shift infrastructure as the town shifts to accommodate erosion and sea level rise.	Low	Request new roads.	High	Ask for new roads, updated water and sewer treatment plants, and a new landfill	High	Ask for new roads and updated or new utilities; request a new or expanded landfill.
Energy Infrastructure	None	This will have to be moved to accommodate erosion and sea level rise.	Low	Expanded airport will run off existing power plant, could request new energy sources.	High	Ask for new types of sources for the power plant: Natural Gas, Solar, and Wind to supplement or replace current energy sources. Still need back up diesel power.	High	Ask for new types of sources for the power plant: Natural Gas, Solar, and Wind to supplement or replace current energy sources. Need back up diesel power.
Airport	Low	Should update the existing facilities, but do not need to expand greatly.	Medium	Develop a larger airport, with access to the man camp	High	Build to support in town for personnel and equipment.	Medium/high	Upgrade for spill and emergency response, possibly ask for the airport to be located further apart from the town.
Port/dock	Low	The dock will be slightly expanded, for the spill response.	Medium	The dock will have to be expanded	High	The dock will have to be expanded.	Medium/high	The dock will be expanded, and moved out of the waterfowl habitat.
Spill Response Capacity	Low	Some spill response will be located here.	Medium	Need to plan for personnel and facilities.	High	Capacity built as part of town.	Medium	Capacity built as part of construction camp.
Subsistence Hunting	Medium	Require that oil companies avoid hunting grounds when building man camp.	High	Require that oil companies avoid hunting grounds and species habitats when building man camp.	High	Require that oil companies avoid hunting grounds when building man camp.	High	Require that oil companies avoid hunting grounds when building man camp.
Welfare of Community	Low/None	There will be some influx of people to the area, so the town will need to increase security, but there will be a minimal impact on the community.	Low	Request additional security for the town.	High	Ask for a community center to be built, one that can be used by both local residents and residents of the man camp. Request additional security and new medical facilities for both mental and physical illnesses.	High	Ask for community amenities like a permanent recreation center to be included in the construction/man camp where the residents would move to.
Economic Multiplier Effect	Low/None	Some services will need to expand to support researchers and spill response. Ex: hotel, restaurants, etc.	Low	Create new businesses to support the natural growth that will occur from oil development occurring here, as well as the construction of the man camp. Ex: expanded hotel	High	Create local businesses to supply the man camp with amenities such as laundry and food (greenhouses). Have these businesses be owned and operated by locals. Apply for Alaska Growth Capital seed money to start new businesses.	Medium	Additional local businesses could be created, but not as intense in the long term as the integrated scenario.

RUTGERS

Edward J. Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy

Threats-Opportunities Analysis

- Threats range from none to high
- Opportunities suggest community benefits from development
- This is a starting point for community-driven planning

			Scenario 2- Integrated		Scenario 3- Hybrid Scenario
	Attributes	Threat	Opportunities	Threat	Opportunities
	Impact of Erosion	High	Move houses outside the build-to line, but request new types of buildings and materials.	High	Have the construction camp created to last so the community can move into it when it is no longer in use.
	Sea Level Rise	High	Town has to move, but receives financial assistance from oil development.	High	Town moves into construction camp.
	Impact on Infrastructure	High	Ask for new roads, updated water and sewer treatment plants, and a new landfill	High	Ask for new roads and updated or new utilities; request a new or expanded landfill.
	Energy Infrastructure	High	Ask for new types of sources for the power plant: Natural Gas, Solar, and Wind to supplement or replace current energy sources. Still need back up diesel power.	High	Ask for new types of sources for the power plant: Natural Gas, Solar, and Wind to supplement or replace current energy sources. Need back up diesel power.
	Airport	High	Build to support in town for personnel and equipment.	Medium/ high	Upgrade for spill and emergency response, possibly ask for the airport to be located further apart from the town.
	Port/dock	High	The dock will have to be expanded.	Medium/ high	The dock will be expanded, and moved out of the waterfowl habitat.
	Spill Response Capacity	High	Capacity built as part of town.	Medium	Capacity built as part of construction camp.
	Subsistence Hunting	High	Require that oil companies avoid hunting grounds when building man camp.	High	Require that oil companies avoid hunting grounds when building man camp.
	Welfare of Community	High	Ask for a community center to be built, one that can be used by both local residents and residents of the man camp. Request additional security and new medical facilities for both mental and physical illnesses.	High	Ask for community amenities like a permanent recreation center to be included in the construction/man camp where the residents would move to.
	Economic Multiplier Effect	High	Create local businesses to supply the man camp with amenities such as laundry and food (greenhouses). Have these businesses be owned and operated by locals. Apply for Alaska Growth Capital seed money to start new businesses.	Medium	Additional local businesses could be created, but not as intense in the long term as the integrated scenario.



Conclusions

- Patterns of Development
- Community Values and Needs
- Opportunities for planning and funding

Questions?